

# MILLER OVERTHROWN:

OR THE  
FALSE PROPHET CONFOUNDED.

BY A COSMOPOLITE.

"Of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven,  
neither the Son, but the Father."

-----

BOSTON:  
ABEL TOMPKINS.  
1840.

-----

Entered according to act of Congress, in the year 1840, by  
ABEL TOMPKINS,  
in the Clerk's office of the District Court of Massachusetts.

## GENERAL REMARKS

The time in which we live appears to be rife with inventions. The rage for novelty is unbounded. We marvel that Mohammed, aided by the sword, succeeded in converting so many to his doctrine. But Mohammed acknowledged certain fundamental truths; and, to use a nautical phrase, from them he took his departure. He took advantage of the popular belief in Judaism and Christianity, and molded that belief into such shape as answered his purpose. If a man heard the alarm of fire, and became convinced that a conflagration was raging in some part of the city, it might be easy for an impostor to persuade him that the house of Mr. A, Mr. B, or Mr. C, was burning, and even that one of the tenant's family had perished in the flames. Convince a countryman that the smallpox is raging in Boston, and you may locate the disorder in any part of the city which suits your convenience.

The skeptic believes nothing, and is not deceived by false prophets. He rejects the premises, and the argument falls to the ground. The true believer must watch, or he will fall into error. The skeptic is a ship becalmed; the believer is a ship under full headway: the helm must be nicely watched, or the vessel will run upon the rocks. The Saviour told his church to beware of the lo heres and lo theres. No such caution was necessary for the unbelieving Jews.

This is the day of strange things. We have phrenology, animal magnetism, sleeping preaching, political crises, and the end of the world. Many modern inventions are truly useful, for science pursues her steady and onward march; but science is always followed by her shadow, which some mistake for the substance. The same may be said of *religion*. The benign effects of Christianity upon the world, since its first introduction by the blessed Redeemer, may be traced in all our social institutions; but there is a shade even to this picture, for the recipients of religion are but men. Hence we have to mourn over the consequences of bigotry, intolerance, and fanaticism. Many deceivers have crept under the sacred mantle of religion, and Mr. William Miller is one of them. Whether he has been first himself deceived, or whether he is wittingly practising a *pious fraud*, is known to the Searcher of hearts. I have but to point out sundry errors and weak places in his book; sufficient, however to destroy his credibility, but not to prove that the end of the world is distant; for "of that day knoweth no man"; and we are told that it is even hidden from the angels.

If a man were to prophesy that, on a certain day during the next year, Washington city would be destroyed by an earthquake, who could positively declare the contrary? I pretend not to know that the world will survive the year 1843; but I think that Mr. William Miller knows as little about it as I do.

Predictions similar to that which we are noticing have been made at various times. About forty years ago it was currently reported, among a certain class of the community, that a child, on first coming into the world, miraculously spoke, and declared that, on a certain

day, the consummation of all things would take place. A Mr. Edwards, of New York, fixed upon a certain day in the year 1812 for that important event. He published it through a speaking-trumpet about the streets, and many weak men and women believed the report. The day came, and with it a tempest. In the country many trees were blown down, and large hailstones smote the earth. Many fell on their knees and prayed for mercy. The storm passed by, and their fears were at an end. But it would be just to conclude that the effect of those fears was far from salutary, and that they were calculated to work much mischief upon persons in delicate health. The Almighty has wisely hidden that day from us. Let the man who would rashly essay to raise the veil, ponder well upon the responsibility he assumes. Let him not imagine that he does God service by terrifying the weak, and, in this way, driving them into the church. Such was not the policy of the apostle, who cautioned the flock not to be terrified by word or by epistle, as if the great day of the Lord was at hand. Let those clergymen who willfully encourage Miller's imposture bear in mind that the cause of truth can never be aided by deception; and that, if they should *now* gain a few converts through his instrumentality, their loss will eventually be greater than their gain. That portion of their wall which is built with his untempered mortar will, when it fall, carry with it some of the more sound mason-work, and "great will be the fall thereof." Those who are driven into the church by groundless fears will prove sad converts when those fears are removed by the disgraceful exposure of their prophet. A sectarian triumph of three years will hardly compensate them for the reproof of their own consciences, and for making merchandise of men by feigned words, or by withholding sound ones. Suppose that Christ had not risen from the dead; then would the apostle's faith have been in vain; and how can it be expected that those who have embraced religion on the credit of Mr. Miller's prediction will remain firm in the faith after the imposture is exposed?

If Miller is desirous of making money, it appears to me that he might have chosen some more harmless species of charlatanry than wandering about the country and frightening the simple inhabitants. His manner of dealing with his subject is reprehensible. He not only strains the meaning of the text, gives forced and unnatural constructions, but also abounds in palpable falsehoods, and evinces a vindictive and intolerant spirit, better becoming an imp of Satan than a follower of Jesus Christ our Lord.

I believe the man is a farmer; and he is doubtless very conversant with cattle of all kinds; and therefore handles calves, rams, and horned beasts generally, like one who has been brought up to the business. He frequently takes "a slide" from the tip of one horn to the root of another, and, indeed, moves among them so recklessly as to in manifest danger of impalement.

It must be a matter of surprise to those who have been seduced by the ravings of this man, that no commentator, no learned or erudite man, since the establishment of Christianity, has come to the same conclusions with himself. The truth is, that no man of name and influence has yet had the presumption to point out that "day for which all other days were made." It remained for this famous *revivalist* to make the grand discovery, and that by the force of mathematical reasoning. It is remarkable that none of the learned Jews, who are

so conversant with the Old Scriptures, that none of the apostles, fathers, or modern divines, have been beforehand with the gentleman from Hampton. Of course, he proscribes all the parsons and priests of modern date, and pronounces the D.D.'s a set of ambitious, skeptical, and avaricious ignoramuses. Nothing is more useless than a liberal education, in the eyes of those who never enjoyed its advantages. It is evident, however, that the gentleman is very partial to arithmetic.

If Miller's calculations are correct, it is very evident that he is wiser than the angels, the prophets, the apostles, and the saints. It was an angel who was commanded to make Daniel understand the vision. Now, if that angel showed the prophet that the world would be destroyed in 2300 years, then is it not true, as Christ declared, that "of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the *angels* which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father."

We are also informed that, "In such an hour as you think not, the Son of man cometh;" which will not be the case with the *Millerites*, if his prediction shall be fulfilled.

The author of this work, in replying to William Miller, is principally actuated by a desire to set truth in the foremost rank; and, in so doing, he feels called upon to answer him in the plainest and simplest manner, without evasion or compromise. Consequently, this work cannot be sectarian. Plain truth will do justice to all sects, without favor or partiality. I feel myself the opponent of Miller's theory; and, if he does injustice to any unpopular class of the community, and thus strengthens his argument by appealing to common prejudice, even at the risk of being considered partial to such injured class of the community. But this work is not written for the purpose of building up any particular creed; and I hope its effect -- if it have any effect -- will be rather to sink arbitrary distinctions, and establish that universal charity which becomes us as brethren of the same great family.

As I have brought my labors to a conclusion in less than two weeks from the time when I first saw Miller's book; and as I had previously no knowledge whatever of the ground he took, or the arguments he used, it can occasion no surprise if my answer lacks the completeness or finish which, under other circumstances, I should have regarded as indispensable.

I saw this wolf ravaging the flock; I saw weak men and timid women turning pale at the name of this ferocious animal, dismayed at his howlings, and yet following him in his track: there was no time to select a patent rifle, and to cast the nicely-rounded ball. I snatched down the rusty musket from over the mantle, and, thrusting in a handful of slugs, pursued him to his den. Whether my shot has taken effect or not, the public must judge.

*Boston, February, 1840.*

# MILLER OVERTHROWN.

-----

## CHAPTER I.

The first lecture in Miller's book appears designed to prove that there will be a day of judgment and resurrection of the dead, when the world will be destroyed by fire. In this point, our author does not differ from many other professing Christians; and I shall not examine his doctrines, only in so far as they are peculiar to himself. Yet, even in the first lecture, there are some things worthy of notice. He states that, "at the destined hour," all things on earth shall be purged and cleansed by fire; that the earth shall rise from its ashes pure and sanctified, and that here the Lord Jesus shall reign in person, and all his holy saints with him. At this time, the wicked will be destroyed, together with the "antichristian beast," whose civil power, he says, is already destroyed, but which shall now be burned with fire, and her flesh given to the dogs. Our author gloats over the reeking limbs of this beast very much as if he were one of those devouring dogs himself; and certainly no animal, either human or bestial, ever betrayed the same exulting ferocity over a fallen enemy which this man does in the prospect of witnessing the destruction and utter despair of our Catholic neighbors. It is to be feared that he knows not what manner of spirit he is of.

As a sample of the general unfairness which characterizes Miller's work, let the reader take the following: In his very first lecture, he speaks of Christ's prophecy respecting the destruction of the temple, and quotes largely from the 24th chapter of Matthew, to prove that his views of a final day of judgment are orthodox. After giving us all which he thinks will strengthen his argument, he carefully omits the 36th verse:

But of that day and hour knoweth no man; no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only.

Why does this great advocate of the Bible so lightly skip over the above verse? It came directly in his way, and required an explanation. He is continually bawling about the importance of those texts which he imagines to be favorable to his own views, but brushes away the others as if unworthy of his notice. Does not this prove that the man is going about to establish his own doctrines, and not the doctrines which are taught in holy Scripture? What confidence can be placed in so uncandid a commentator? Has he ever read that "the Scripture is of no private interpretation?" If so, how dare he thus pick and cull in order to make it bend to his individual opinions? Is this the course of an honest man?

In this lecture there are many texts brought from the Old Testament which evidently have no allusion to the last day; but they are all worked in, and harnessed to his team, without regard to reason or propriety. What does the reader think of the following texts? They are unceremoniously applied to the day of final judgment:

Balaam was constrained to admit, "Out of Jacob shall he that shall have dominion, and shall destroy him that remaineth of the city," plainly referring to the judgment day; for he says, "Alas! who shall live when God doeth this?"

Our author says,

And Moses as plainly refers to this day in Deut. xxxii. 43: "Rejoice, O ye nations, with his people; for he will avenge the blood of his servants, and will render vengeance to his adversaries, and will be merciful to his land and to his people."

Such texts are brought forward in support of the belief in a general judgment, and the destruction of this globe by fire.

It is plain that the gentleman belongs to the old school of theologians who thrived in Scotland in the time of Oliver Cromwell. One of those worthies preached with great zeal against gayety of apparel and personal decorations. It was at that time common with the bucks or dandies to wear a bunch of hair on top of the forehead, which they styled the *top-knot*. The preacher gave out his text: "Let him that is on the house-top not come down." He then expressed his intention of improving on the latter part of the text, and immediately vociferated, in tones of thunder, "*Top-not*, come down!" From this portion of Scripture he proved, to the satisfaction of the brethren, that the Saviour had always held top-knots in great detestation, and that all who were found with those crowns of Satan on their heads at the great day of vengeance, would be burnt up like stubble.

Who can fail to trace the resemblance between the anti-top-knot preacher and the gentleman from Hampton when he reads the following text, brought forward in support of the doctrine of a general judgment, and the destruction of the world by fire, (Mal. iv. 2):

But unto you that fear my name shall the sun of righteousness arise with healing in his wings, and ye shall go forth and grow up as calves of the stall.

It is certainly very difficult to understand this passage as our author does, unless we infer from it the destruction of the world on the ground that calves are fatted for the slaughter.

Before concluding the lecture, our author warns his readers against the sin of unbelief -- the sin of disbelieving *him*. He evidently regards himself as one of the watchmen, now commissioned to give the midnight cry, "Behold, the bridegroom cometh!" Eternal punishment is threatened against those who disregard the warning voice of Mr. Miller, and those who will not adopt his interpretations of the prophecies! Presently we shall hear him storming about the infallibility of the pope; whereas it is notorious that no pope ever presumed to name the day on which the world should be destroyed. But all men are

menaced with eternal damnation who do not acknowledge the infallibility of Mr. William Miller, the arithmetical prophet!

This lecture concludes with an earnest exhortation to the sinner to repent; and, in short, the strain of the whole book will lead many to believe that the writer has been set on by certain mercenary sectarians, to get up an excitement and fill their meeting-houses. There is quite as much fraud as fanaticism in this business.

## CHAPTER II.

In his second lecture the impostor undertakes to explain "the first resurrection." He incorrectly states that "the word *resurrection* is nowhere used in a figurative sense." How does he understand the following:

I am the resurrection and the life: if a man believe in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live.

Does our author infer that Jesus had already risen from the dead, or that those who do not believe in Christ will be annihilated? Is not the life here spoken of a spiritual one; and does not the Saviour mean to say that he is the sovereign power which animates those who are dead in trespasses and sins? Read John iii. 36.

"He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the *Son shall not see life*; but the wrath of God abideth on him.

I cannot believe that Miller has *accidentally* overlooked these texts; but I am persuaded that he is determined to build up a theory, in defiance both of Scripture and common sense. Now when a man does this, he places himself above the Scripture, subjecting revelation to his own private judgment. He places himself above all that is called God, and, sitting in the temple of God, does, in effect, give out that he is God.

The arrogant assumptions of this man are beyond parallel. He commands all men to believe him, on pain of damnation, and triumphs over the prospective wailings of sinners, as if he expected to be clad in a fire-proof jacket when the immense bonfire should take place.

That being raised into newness of life is figuratively spoken of as a resurrection, must be evident to every reader who will turn to Rom. vi. 4-13:

Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For, if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall also in the likeness of his *resurrection*. Knowing this, that our old man is

crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin; for he that is dead is freed from sin. Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him; knowing that Christ, being raised from the dead, dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him: for in that he died, he died unto sin once; but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God. Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be *dead* indeed unto sin, but *alive* unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord. Let not sin, therefore, reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof. Neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin; but yield yourselves unto God, as those that are *alive from the dead*, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God.

Here we perceive that Christ declared himself to be "the resurrection and the life," and Paul illustrates and explains the figure. But this would not suit Mr. Miller's theory; therefore plain Scripture testimony must be thrust aside to make way for 1843.

After saying that the righteous will be raised a thousand years before the wicked, and that they will live a thousand years upon the earth in a happy and holy state, he quotes from Rev. xx. 1. He says that the angel who came down from heaven and bound Satan a thousand years was the Lord Jesus himself. We object to this, on the ground that all the angels are but ministers of Christ. He now describes the reign of the saints on earth after the world has been purified by fire, and the devil pinioned.

Here we have Miller's first resurrection. He continues:

Then comes in our text, which has and will be explained in the lecture, 7th verse: "And, when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison."

He adds:

We may reasonably expect that, when Satan is let loose, all the damned spirits are let loose with him; and it has been strongly implied they were to live again in the body at the end of the thousand years, 8th verse: "And shall go out," that is, Satan, "to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth."

In order to show that, at the time of loosing Satan, there were none but holy saints upon the earth, our author finds it necessary to let loose all the damned spirits with him. However necessary this may be to prove Miller's theory, we find no such thing in the Scriptures; but we do read, in the last chapter of Revelations, 18th verse

For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book.

Concerning the enlargement of Satan, the Scripture saith, verses 7, 8,

And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, and shall go out to deceive the *nations* which *are* in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Mogog, to gather them together to battle; the number of whom is as the sand of the sea. And they went up the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city, &c.

Here we are distinctly taught that the saints will not inhabit the whole earth, and that the whole earth will not be pure and regenerated; for all save the city is inhabited by the



wicked nations. But these wicked insurgents are slain by fire from heaven; and this is what our author terms "the second death;" for he states that what follows is only another view of the same things. So far from that, what follows is a continuation of the vision; and it is not until after the general resurrection of the dead that the second death occurs, as the apostle testifies, verse 14: "And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. *This* is the second death."

A more willful perversion of Scripture can hardly be conceived. The text says that fire came down from heaven and devoured the belligerent sinners, and immediately continues:

*And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night forever and forever.*

On the strength of this, our dishonest commentator adds:

*In this verse* the final condemnation of the wicked, soul and body, is given, and the last that God has seen fit to reveal concerning them to us, that they are cast into everlasting torment.

Not a syllable is here said about casting *the wicked* into everlasting torment. We learn that the wicked nations were *devoured* by fire from heaven; but that Satan, who deceived them, was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone. Here is not, therefore, the judgment of the wicked; and the apostle goes on to speak of the final judgment. Our author follows the apostle through what he terms his *second* vision, until the sea has given up her dead, and death and hell have surrendered up their inhabitants to be judged; and then says:

I conclude the apostle, after he had seen the righteous dead raised, small and great, and stand before God, and saw the book of life open to justify them, and saw them judged and rewarded, *he then* GLIDES down to the end of the thousand years, and beheld the wicked dead given up by those elements and places wherein they had been confined, during the millennial period, to be judged in the flesh, every man according to his works.

Had the apostle been as slippery a sinner as himself, he might have *glided* through a thousand years in this manner, and have kept his own counsel in the mean time. The gentleman is very sensible of the difficulty into which he has plunged himself, and adds:

This only can reconcile some of those conflicting passages (or seemingly so to us) concerning the resurrection; and I cannot see any impropriety in thus understanding these prophecies, for it is the common manner of the prophets, here a little and there a little.

It is certainly the common manner of Mr. Miller to *pick out* "here a little and there a little," in order to build up a theory which the whole tenor of Scripture absolutely condemns; and, when he speaks of "conflicting passages," the reader must see that this chapter contains passages which conflict with nothing but chimerical theories like that under examination. Hence the necessity of *gliding over* a thousand years, as well as a thousand passages, in order to establish the crude system of Miller.

Our author shows a most indecent haste to have the "antichristian beast" destroyed, and all the wicked safely housed in hell. We cannot avoid applying to him the words of Capt.

Thornton to Baillie Nicoll Jarvie, who counseled the immediate execution of the Highland scout: "Be patient, sir; for, when it comes your own turn to be hanged, you will be in no such ----- hurry!"

Our author regales himself with the following comfortable reflections:

Here the children of the kingdom are persecuted, tormented, perplexed, cast down; but, in the kingdom of God, their enemies are all slain; they are comforted, glorified, justified, exalted, and *not a dog to move his tongue*.

Our author doubtless expects to take his stand among the happy hosts: his skill in arithmetic alone ought to entitle him to that distinction; while his intense hatred of sinners and ten-horned animals gives evidence that he has triumphed over human nature.

I hazard the opinion that when it shall please God to plunge sinners into the gulf of eternal woe, he can do it without any of Mr. Miller's assistance; and the extreme officiousness of that gentleman, in this respect, would lead a stranger to mistake him for one of the tormenting imps of the lower regions, instead of an angel of the heavenly kingdom. There are in this lecture some rare commentaries on passages of holy writ; but I cannot now pause to edify the reader with gleanings. The harvest is so rich, that we can well spare those precious droppings of the wheat sheaves.

I would here remark that nothing is more easy than the founding of a plausible theory from the Scriptures, so that you exercise a little ingenuity. By choosing such texts as suit your purposes, explaining some of them literally, and others figuratively, now and then appealing to the prejudices of the community, and anon exciting their fears, you may hammer out a system as unlike the truth as possible; yet which; although full of holes, like the cobweb, may yet entangle such flies as have not the strength of wing to force a passage through it.

### CHAPTER III.

We are now to examine Mr. Miller as an arithmetician; and, although the sum which he compasses, and proves *to his own satisfaction*, is a very simple one, yet let it be remembered that the attraction of gravitation was discovered by so simple a circumstance as the fall of a ripe apple; and that apples have fallen ever since the world was created. This old earth has been careering through the fields of ether some six thousand years; yet she has, until now, been without a navigator to keep her reckoning, and admonish the crew and passengers when she had nearly arrived at the end of her voyage.

The gentleman introduces his third lecture with the following text:

Dan. viii. 13, 14. Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain saint which spake, How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot? And he said unto me, Unto two thousand three hundred days: then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.

Our author adds, "or, justified, as it might have been translated."

Our author begins to explain what is meant in the text by "the daily sacrifice." He says,

It is very evident, when we carefully examine our text, that it is to be understood as referring to pagan and papal rites; for it stands coupled with "the abomination of desolation," and performs the same acts, such as are ascribed to the papal abomination -- "to give both the sanctuary and host to be trodden under foot."

He says,

See also Rev. xi. 2 : "But the court which is without the temple leave out, and measure it not; for it is given unto the Gentiles; and the holly city shall they tread under foot forty and two months." This last text only has reference to the papal beast, which was the image of the pagan.

It is well to state here that we are rather diffident about defining the meaning of the Scripture texts: it will be perceived that our author has no scruples on that head. He has a perfect knowledge of the Bible, and has *ciphered it all out*.

Our author says that by *the sanctuary* we must understand the temple at Jerusalem, and those who worshipped therein; and that by *the host* we must understand the Christian church, "who worship in the outer court," and are said to be strangers and pilgrims on the earth, having no continual places, &c.

This is certainly figurative enough; and it is in this way that the Bible may be made to mean anything. At the time that Daniel saw this vision, he was a captive in Babylon. He was concerned about his own people and their worship, and inquired, with the very natural anxiety of a pious young man, how long the sanctuary should be violated; and he was answered, two thousand and three hundred days, which was the whole time in which Antiochus persecuted his people, he being cut off by death at the end of six years and nearly four months from the time that he commenced his persecutions. With respect to the word host, it is no more allusion to the Christians than it has to Jefferson's gun-boats, and is sometimes translated the strength. Some zealous men, in their eagerness to prove the divine mission of the Messiah, would make it appear that the Jewish prophets knew more about the future condition of the Christian church than did the apostles themselves.

But it is needful that our author should give a peculiar meaning to the text -- otherwise 2300 days could not stand for 2300 years -- and fix the time for the resurrection in 1843.

Nevertheless, we ought to be very cautious about disputing Mr. Miller, when he brings forward such powerful proofs as the following:

What must we understand by days? In the prophecy of Daniel, it is invariably to be reckoned years; for God hath so ordered the prophets to reckon days. Num. xiv. 34. "After the number of days in which you searched the land, even forty days, each day for a year, shall you bear your iniquities, even forty years." Ezek. iv. 5,6. "For I have laid upon thee the years of their iniquity, according to the number of the days, three hundred and ninety days; so shalt thou bear the iniquity of the house of Israel. And when thou hast accomplished them, lie again on thy right side, and thou shalt bear the iniquity of the house of Judah forty days: I have appointed thee each day for a year." In these passages we prove the command of God. We will also show that it was so called in the days of Jacob, when he served for Rachel. Gen. xxix. 27. "Fulfill her week, (seven days,) and we will give thee this also, for the service which thou shalt serve with me yet other seven years."

After this, who can entertain a doubt that Jonah was three years in the whale's belly? By that time, he must have been in a fine condition for gliding and sliding. The people of Ninevah took time by the forelock in performing their works of penance, seeing that the term of safety extended to forty years. Our author might, in order to prove some other point, quote from the scriptures, 2 Pet. iii. 8: "But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day:" and this declaration is made by St. Peter immediately after affirming that the heavens and the earth were "reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of unholy men."

Our author, however, is resolved that one day shall invariably mean one year. On such brittle premises does Mr. Miller build up his system, and, with no better seal to his mission, wanders about the country, alarming the weak, and disgusting the wise.

But he says that "the daily sacrifice" applies to pagan and papal rites; for it stands coupled with "the abomination of desolation." The latter phrase may be applied to more than one event; such as that under Antiochus; also when the Jewish temple was razed by the Romans; and also anti-Christ, who, it is supposed, will come at some future day, near the consummation of all things: but if the "Roman beast" was anti-Christ, then should the world have been destroyed a thousand years ago. There are no Papal rites to which the term "daily sacrifice" could allude. It can be applied only to a custom among pagans and Jews.

The text from Revelations was of course written by St. John, while on the island of Patmos, whither he had been banished; and it probably alludes to the fact that the pagan persecutors always surrounded the true worshippers, who were obliged to secrete themselves in sepulchers, caves, and other secret places, where they reared their altars and attended to their religious duties; but of this there is no certainty.

Our author next slides into the vision of Nebuchadnezzar's image, and then the vision of the four beasts. The latter beast probably means pagan Rome; and the text which Miller quotes from Dan. vii. 21, 22, probably alludes to the downfall of the pagan power, and the triumph of Christianity under Constantine:

I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them, until the Ancient of days came, [i.e. God arose for their deliverance,] and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High; and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom.

This will be more apparent when we reflect that the prophet is speaking of one of the kingdoms of this world, and not of an immortal and supernatural existence. It is not probable that these prophecies have any allusion to the sins of the Christians, as our author, in the plenitude of his sectarianism, would have us believe.

Our author mentions the seventy weeks, previous to the cutting off of the Messiah, each day counting one year; and he argues from this that the 2300 days should be reckoned 2300 years. But the former prophecy alluded to a distant event, and an event of great and surpassing importance; while the latter was one in which Daniel was peculiarly interested, as an Israelite. I will illustrate this: The angel might have used the term seventy weeks -- one day for a year -- when speaking of the Messiah; but if Daniel had asked him how long it would be before he heard from Jerusalem and from his relatives there, he would have been answered in a more familiar style. In speaking of a young man recently deceased, we might say, "he was cut off in the morning of life," thus applying phrase proper to the early part of the day to a term of years; but if it was a colt that had died, we should say, "he was two years old." The more important the prophecy, the more likely would the angel be to speak in mystical terms.

Being willing to assist our author all we can, we will mention in passing, a discovery of our own, although he may have already found it out. According to his calculation, there were just as many weeks of years before the birth of Christ as there will be months of years when the world is destroyed. If there were 534 years from the time that the angel gave his last instructions to Daniel, up to the birth of Christ, there were 76 weeks and a fraction inclusive. Now 2300 years from the time that Daniel held his conversation with the angel are 76 months of years and a fraction inclusive. This is a coincidence which the Millerites may not all have noticed.

But let us see if we cannot find another coincidence, which will serve to show that Mr. Miller might have explained the vision, without burning us all up in 1843. We have said that if the 2300 days were understood literally, it would make six years and nearly four months -- the term of Antiochus's persecutions. But, if we reckon them 2300 weeks, it will make 44 years, the period when "the sanctuary was cleansed," and when, according to Mr. Miller's own showing, Ezra had liberty to build Jerusalem. To use our author's words, -- "Here, then, we find the fulfillment of what the angel told Daniel would be done under the command that would begin the seventy weeks, and which is the same thing, the vision."

Let us examine this point a little. The angel tells Daniel that seventy weeks (of years) after the order goes forth to build Jerusalem, the death of Christ would be consummated. But Daniel had desired to know how long Jerusalem should be in the power of the foe, and her sanctuary profaned. He is answered, 2300 days -- not of years but of weeks -- and in just 44 years after this conversation, the decree is accordingly given to rebuild Jerusalem, to purify the sanctuary, and restore the true worship. This is one theory, and I think it is a much more easy and natural one than that of the gentlemen from Hampton; but neither of us may be right. Let the reader turn to chapter and verse, and compare what is here written with Scripture itself.

After a great deal of senseless and incoherent raving about horns, images, and beasts, which serves but to show the acrimony of the author's zeal, and the ferociousness of his disposition, the third lecture closes with an address to the sinner. I close this chapter by an address to the arithmetical saint himself. Go home, sir, to your closet, fall on your knees, pray God to forgive you for all that you have charged upon better men than yourself; and, above all, seek to obtain a clean heart, purged from rancorous sectarianism, falsehood, and fiend-like enmity. You are, at present, in the gall of bitterness, and the bond of iniquity.

#### CHAPTER IV.

Mr. Miller commences his fourth lecture with the following text:

Dan. ix. 24. Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy.

Our author goes on to say, that

This text furnished Simeon, Anna, Nathaniel, and others, with a strong faith that they should see the consolation of Israel.

Whether it was this text or the Holy Ghost which enabled those faithful ones to discern the Messiah in Jesus of Nazareth, I will not pretend to decide; but it is most singular that neither of them, nor of the disciples, nor of the scribes or Pharisees, nor of the early promulgators of the gospel, understood the "cleansing of the sanctuary" in 2300 days to mean the destruction of the world and the resurrection in 1843. It is plain that the disciples understood no such thing, although they were conversant with the Jewish scriptures, and with the prophet Daniel in an especial manner. They demanded of Christ when the end of the world should come. In speaking of the destruction of Jerusalem, the Saviour says:

But when you shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing where it ought not, (let him that readeth understand,) then let them that be in Judea flee to the mountains.

Of course this alludes to the Roman devastations, and has nothing to do with the end of the world; and the "abominations of desolation" implies the heathen sacrilege, or desecration of the holy temple and the holy city, which they utterly destroyed.

The Saviour then goes on -- as Mr. Miller believes -- to describe the consummation of all terrestrial things, and adds: "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." It therefore appears that, however the good men and women may have been enlightened by Daniel's vision, with

respect to the time of the Savior's appearance on earth, neither they nor any other person - not even the angels -- could draw from that vision, any information touching the time when the world should be destroyed. But if the angels knew not, as Christ expressly says, how then could the angels have revealed the secret to Daniel? All this our author passes by in silence; and pronounces the sentence of endless damnation on such as prefer the testimony of the Scripture to his own revival-hatching opinion. I have heard of popes who excommunicated men for denying the faith of many centuries; but this modern pope would send us all to perdition for differing from *him* in his private interpretation of the Scriptures; and I have not a shadow of doubt, that, if he possessed the power, he would imprison and burn all such as disputed the *orthodoxy* invented by himself.

The holy and inspired apostles did not pretend to know when the resurrection would take place. How unfortunate that they had not the key to the old Scriptures, which has since been found by William Miller of Hampton! St. Paul says, in writing to the Thessalonians,

But of the times and the seasons, brethren, ye have no need that I write unto you, for yourselves know perfectly, that the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night, to him and to all.

Consequently he knew nothing of the time when he should come. He had never *ciphered out* Daniel's vision. Again, Paul writes:

Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter, as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand.

Why, what an oversight in Paul! Did he not know that this was the way to throw cold water upon revivals, and to quiet people's minds, when they ought to be stirred up by impending horrors? Ah! but Paul knew nothing of Mr. Miller's 2300 days; he was very dull at figures, because he had not all the light which the thousand and one sects of this day enjoy.

The most holy St. Peter says, in his second General Epistle:

But the heavens and the earth which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men. But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. The Lord is not slack concerning his promise as some count slackness; but is long-suffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance. (Chap. iii. 7-9.)

Who can gather from the above, that St. Peter entertained any opinion with regard to the time? In fact, this was hidden even from the inspired apostles, and they were left to form their own conjectures. From men and angels, as Christ says, that day was hidden. The holy apostles were taught by the Holy Ghost all that was needful for them and the church in that day; and they neither wrote nor asserted any thing contrary to the truth; but it was not given them to know *when* the world would be destroyed. Even the Son of man received not that from his Father, as one of the truths to be communicated to us. In the bosom of that eternal Being, whose fiat spoke myriad's of worlds into existence, reposes the dread

secret; and neither apostle, nor angel, nor martyr, nor saint, was ever intrusted with its keeping -- known only to God. But William Miller has ferreted it out: he has done it by figures. Everyone knows that "figures never lie" -- consequently the 2300 days must inevitably stand for 2300 years; and "cleansing the sanctuary" at Jerusalem must imply the burning up of the world, and a grand *auto de fe* of all who do not believe in the infallibility of William Miller, the revivalist.

Our author says it was by this text -- the one quoted in the beginning of this chapter -- that Caiaphas, the high-priest, knew it was expedient for Jesus to die.

And one of them named Caiaphas, being high-priest that same year, said unto them, Ye know nothing at all, nor consider that it is expedient for us that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not. (John xi. 49, 50.)

What shall we say to this abominable profanation of holy Scripture! Here we are told by Mr. Miller that the high-priest put to death the Lord of life and glory, knowing him to be the Messiah, the Prince of peace, the promised Shiloh!! Thus has this desperate commentator made the Jews the willful murderer of their Messiah, and branded the Son of God on the cross with *falsehood*; for he expressly says in his intercession for them, "*They know not what they do.*"

The prophecy of Daniel concerning Christ is so full, that no one could have mistaken the true character of Jesus Christ, had he supposed those passages to apply to him. Now Miller says that Jesus was cut off by the Jews, when the Jews *knew* that he was their Messiah and the Holy One of God! Monstrous thought! The Jews did *not* believe that Christ Jesus was the person spoken of by the prophet, and they put him to death for professing to be the Son of God and the king of the Jews. We might almost expect this commentator, in the next place, to fling *the ear* of the high-priest's servant into our teeth, as scriptural proof that the wicked are to be *cut off* in 1843.

After a little more wrestling of Scripture, and bold assertion, the gentleman closes his fourth lecture, as usual, by warning sinners of the approach of the great day. This, like a woman's postscript, is always meant to be the most important and effectual part of the lecture -- the grand finale -- and sufficiently explains the object of the writer in putting together such a mass of blasphemy and nonsense.

## CHAPTER V.

The fifth lecture commences with this text:

Rev. xiii. 18. Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast; for it is the number of a man; and his number is six hundred three score and six.



**Our author then goes on as follows:**

This text has caused as much speculation as any text in the whole Bible; rivers of ink have been shed in trying to explain its meaning; brains have been addled in trying to find some great mystery which the wisdom of this world, as was supposed, could only discover; and, in trying to be wise above what was written, men have lost their balance, and fell into absurdities too ridiculous to mention.

**You need not mention them; for your illustration is sufficiently ample without notes or *appenda*; if, indeed, there may not be more fraud than fanaticism in your attempts to disturb the public mind. It must be conceded that this lecture smacks more strongly of the former ingredient than of the latter one.**

**In the plenitude of his egregious egotism, he proposes,**

- 1. To show what wisdom it is of which the text speaks.**
- 2. To speak of the beast numbered, and show what beast.**
- 3. The number, and what we may understand by it.**

**First, -- he says that the wisdom here spoken of is not the wisdom of men, and proves by several texts that human wisdom is of small value, when brought to bear upon religious matters. From all of this, we may conclude that he regards arithmetic as a divine science.**

**Secondly, -- the beast numbered in the text. He here says that it is the first beast, mentioned in the fore part of the same chapter. He says, --**

See our context, 12th verse: "And he exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him;" that is, the beast which John saw come up out of the sea, (the Roman government,) "having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns, and upon his head the name of blasphemy; and the beast which I saw was like unto a leopard, and his feet were as the feet of a bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a lion; and the dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority." By this beast, I understand the same as Daniel's fourth kingdom, the Roman government; by "names of blasphemy," I understand a mode of worship which would be idolatrous or blasphemous; by the dragon, we must understand the civil power of the same government giving its power to the ecclesiastical beast, whether pagan or papal. 3d verse: "And I saw one of his heads of [blasphemy, pagan] as it were wounded to death; and his deadly wound was healed, [by the substitution of the papal blasphemous head,] and all the world wondered after the beast."

**Here we perceive that a wounded head may be healed by the substitution of another head. If our author has really the skill to do this thing, what a capital surgeon he would have been in France, at the time the guillotine was doing its work!**

**It was necessary for our author to identify the beast numbered with the first beast, in order that he might apply a verse to him which speaks of the first beast. Accordingly, he *slides* over the second beast, and does not stop until he gets back to the tenth verse:**

**He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity;  
he that killeth with the sword must be killed with the sword. Here is the faith and patience of the saints.**

On the strength of this, our author says of the *first* beast:

In the tenth verse, he shows us how this civil power should be destroyed, by captivity and the sword; and this was fulfilled in 1798, when the pope was carried a captive into France, and the states of Italy were conquered by the sword of the French army.

A mighty event, truly, to make so much ado about! It is true that all Europe felt the edge of Napoleon's sword; but I do not know why the war in Italy should have particularly engaged the attention of the evangelist. But any thing answers our author's purpose.

There is great incongruity in our author's explanations here. He not only slides, but seems to perform that evolution which the lads term *cutting a pigeon-wing*, on skates.

The gentleman states that when the beast received the second head, and his wounded one was thus made whole, the Roman government became papal; and that it was subsequently visited by the sword and captivity. The second beast is next spoken of by the apostle, and the chapter ends with the text in the beginning of this chapter. This text he carries back to the first beast, and applies it to him, with his old head on his shoulders, in order to show that it means pagan Rome, and that her number was 666.

He then goes on to prove that the last vestige of paganism vanished from the Roman empire 666 years from the period when the Romans became connected with the Jews, and, by becoming connected with them, fell under the eye of prophecy. Had the number fallen short of 666, Miller would have shown us that the beast was to remain that number of years after John had the vision, or after some other time convenient for his purpose. But this is most lame; for if this number alludes to the number of years which the beast with ten horns and *seven heads* should reign or exist, how can the mere wounding of *one* of his heads, which wound was healed, be the exit or downfall of the whole beast, with seven heads? What if one man should say that the number of another man's years was forty, when it could be proved that he had merely bruised one of his limbs at the age of forty years, and that limb had been healed again, and he had lived afterward to the age of seventy?

In this lecture we find little said about *the second beast* with horns like a lamb. It appears, however, that the first beast is living, and in good case, while the second beast is making an image to him -- to "the beast which had the wound by a sword and did live." If so, we have popery and paganism both existing at once; but we learn that paganism was put to death, and died in earnest, in the year 508. So says our author. And he endeavors to make this consistent, by bringing up the last verse of the chapter. We learn that the wounded head was truly *healed*, and that the first beast lived. Now our gentleman knows that paganism did not live; so he tries to kill him with the last verse. But, if the last verse applies to the length of time which the beast actually lived, why does our author pretend that it applies to the time which he *had* lived previous to receiving the wound?

Indeed, here is something incomprehensible. He says that one of the beast's heads was wounded to death, and that this wound was inflicted on paganism. Now the apostle tells us that "his deadly wound was *healed*"; not that another head was substituted. Our author

confounds the wound in this head with the death of the beast; but the beast recovered, and did not die. Our author, in speaking of the wound inflicted on one of the beast's heads, says:

And that in the year 496, Clovis, king of France, was converted and baptized into the Christian faith, and that the remainder of these kings (pagan kings) embraced the religion of Christ shortly after, the last of which was christianized in the year 508, and of course paganism ceased, having lost its head by the power of the sword, or kings who wield the sword.

This, he says, makes up the 666 years since pagan Rome had made her league with the Jews; and this is the number of the first beast, or the term of her existence since the league.

Now let us read the testimony of Scripture on this subject, and see whether the number of the first beast was 666 years or not, according to the author's calculation:

And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death: and his deadly wound was healed; and all the world wondered after the beast. And they worshipped the dragon which gave power unto the beast: and they worshipped the beast, saying, Who is like unto the beast? Who is able to make war with him? And there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies; and power was given unto him to continue *forty and two months*.

Now Miller says that the end of this beast was in AD 508; but the Scripture says he had power to continue forty-two months; and Miller says that forty-two months stand for 1260 years. Miller also says, as quoted above, that paganism ceased in 508, having *lost its head*. But the Scripture says its head was healed.

He also says that the forty-two months applies to *the image beast*; but so strange an assertion can best be answered by requesting the reader to turn to the chapter itself. It is plain that the first beast is alive through all the operations of the second beast.

Even admitting that the last verse in the chapter applies to the first beast, it cannot be intended to define the number of years that he lived; because the beast lived after receiving the wound, at which period the 666 years came to an end. Indeed, our author himself says that "the deadly wound was healed, [by the substitution of the papal blasphemous head,] and all the world wondered after the beast." What has the substitution of this new head to do with the lifetime of the beast -- the number of his years? The Scripture says that the beast continued to live, and "his deadly wound was healed"; so that 666 years were not the number of *his* years, nor anything like it. It may be doubted whether this number of 666 alludes to years at all. The words of Scripture are, --

And that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name. Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast; for it is the number of a man; and his number is six hundred three-score and six.

The "number of the beast" probably refers the number of his name as it were upon a roll with other names, and numbered from the top of the roll. Such number would be "the number of the beast."

**I again quote from the fifth lecture:**

Rev. xviii. 7: "And the angel said unto me, Wherefore didst thou marvel? I will tell thee the mystery of the woman, and of the beast that carrieth her, which hath the seven heads and ten horns. The beast that thou sawest was, and is not; and shall ascend out of the bottomless pit, and go into perdition; and they that dwell on the earth shall wonder, whose names are not written in the book of life from the foundation of the world, when they behold the beast that was, and is not, and yet is."

"That was," pagan Rome before John saw his vision; "and is not," yet in its last stage of papal Rome; "and yet is," in the same spirit; for papal Rome is but an image of paganism, as says the apostle, 2 Thess. ii. 6,7: "And now ye know what withholdeth, that he may be revealed in his time, for the mystery of iniquity doth already work." And 1 John ii. 18: "Little children, it is the last time, and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists, whereby we know it is the last time."

**Thus far we have followed our author. Now let us examine his positions.**

The apostle had just been speaking of Babylon, for such was the figurative name applied to pagan Rome, from her resemblance to ancient Babylon. It appears to me that, in order to carry out and explain this figure, he says the beast "that was," meaning old Babylon, which was at that time a heap of ruins; "and is not, because she had been many years a desolate place; "and yet is," which means that she had revived in her prototype, pagan and persecuting Rome. Far be it from me to explain the book of Revelations; which book, according to one of the ancient fathers, "contains almost as many mysteries as words"; but which is, nevertheless, perfectly intelligible to every ranting revivalist of the present day. But I think that my explanation will hold quite as well as that of Miller.

But now let us present one striking example of Mr. Miller's disingenuousness. He says "Papal Rome is but an image of paganism, as saith the apostle." He then quotes from Paul, and then from John, thus: "Little children, it is the last time; and, as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists, whereby we know it is the last time."

We can understand this declaration of the apostle but in one way. The last day was hidden from the apostles, as was elsewhere observed; and they were left to their own conjectures respecting it. But one thing they were assured of, to wit, that antichrist should come before the consummation of all things. They believed that immediately after he came the world would be destroyed. Such, at least, appears to have been the opinion of St. John. Also St. Paul, in writing to the Thessalonians, tells them not to be deceived in regard to the second coming of Christ, as the man of sin must be revealed before he comes. St. John, adopting this view of the subject, says that the last time has arrived, for there are already many antichrists. But what is his definition of antichrist? Did he, as our author contends, mean to say that papal Rome was antichrist? If so, he had a singular way of expressing it. Let us now give the whole of St. John's idea on this subject, instead of one verse. He says,

For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world. And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof; but he that doeth the will of

God abideth forever. Little children, it is the last time; and as ye have heard that the antichrist shall come, [before the last time,] even now are there many antichrists, whereby we know that it is the last time.

The apostle then goes on to describe these antichrists:

They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would, no doubt, have continued with us: but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us.

Thus far, we understand that those antichrists *went out* from the visible church; which cannot be said of the papal church, as it is only said of her that she has become *corrupted*; and this charge of corruption comes from those who have gone out from her.

But let us follow the apostle still farther, and see what are the peculiar characteristics of these antichrists:

But ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things. [This a general epistle to the whole church.] I have not written to you [the whole church] because ye know not the truth, but because ye know it, and that no lie is of the truth. Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? *He is antichrist that denieth the Father and the Son.* Whoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father; but he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also.

Now what could be Mr. Miller's inducement to apply the verse from St. John to papal Rome? Does the church say that Jesus is not the Christ? Does she deny the Father or the Son? But, lest Mr. Miller should endeavor to figure away these express declarations of the apostle with regard to antichrists, let us hear what the same apostle says elsewhere on the same subject; and let it be borne in mind that we are quoting from the writer of the Revelations.

In his second Epistle, St. John says,

For many deceivers are entered in to the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and an antichrist.

I think it unnecessary to say more in evidence that St. John could not have meant to apply the term of antichrist to the papal church.

The following is another precious sample of our author's reasoning:

"And the ten horns which thou sawest upon the beast, these shall hate the whore, and shall make her desolate and naked, and cut her flesh, and burn her with fire."

He then says,

This text has been literally accomplished within a few years; and those kingdoms which were of the ten kingdoms which first gave power to the beast, have, of late, persecuted and destroyed her who is the abomination of the whole earth. Witness the trans- actions of Great Britain, France, Spain, Portugal, Austria, Naples, and Tuscany, the seven kingdoms which were not plucked up by the little horn: each of these nations have, in their turn, resisted the power and pretensions of

the pope of Rome, until his civil authority is reduced to a cipher in all these kingdoms. "For God hath put it into their hearts to fulfill his will, and to agree and give their kingdom unto the beast, until the words of God shall be fulfilled,"

-- when, our author says, the papal beast will be sunk in the deep forever and ever.

Here our author quotes Scripture to prove that these kings will give their kingdom to the beast, "*until* the words of God shall be fulfilled"; that is, *until* the beast shall be smitten and destroyed by the breath of Christ in his second coming. Nevertheless, he has thought proper to tell us that, instead of giving their kingdom to the Roman beast, or civil power, they have persecuted and destroyed him. The Scripture says also that these kings should "burn her with fire." Pagan Rome was, indeed, burned; but this has not happened to papal Rome. Neither could it be said with propriety that papal Rome was the abomination of the whole earth, when France and England, at different times persecuted her. But it might have been said of pagan Rome. In these latter days, we comprise the populous country of China, together with North America, under the denomination of the whole earth. It is true, that Bonaparte persecuted the pope; but he was afterward chained to a rock, and France went back into the old track, while England assisted in restoring the old order of things in Italy.

## CHAPTER VI.

The following text commences the sixth lecture:

Dan. x. 14. Now I am come to make thee understand what shall befall thy people in the latter days; for yet the vision is for many days.

We must here observe that the angel has come to tell Daniel what shall befall his people (the Jews) in the latter days. Mr. Miller chooses to apply the prophecies to the world at large, and to nations that sprung up after the Jews had been scattered over the world by the destruction of Jerusalem. Our author makes the text bend to such circumstances as he chooses, in order to pave the way for the destruction of the world in 1843. In this way, one might easily build up a thousand theories. But some of our author's explanations are absolutely ridiculous; insomuch so, that one can scarcely believe him to be in earnest. To follow him, step by step, from the commencement to the close of this lecture, would be a dizzying task. So much marching and counter marching, doubling and turning, bolting and whirling, as we should be obliged to put in practice, if we kept constantly at his heels, would rather have a tendency to bewilder the common reader than to enlighten him. It shall therefore be our aim to expose his principle absurdities; which may be done in a few words. This lecture is *sophistry sophisticated*; it is darkness painted black; it is the

crookedness of error, pregnant with a knot of serpents; it is madness and folly brayed together in a mortar, until they seem to form but one ingredient.

Beginning at the eleventh chapter of Daniel, our author goes through it, up to the fortieth verse applying the prophecies, verse after verse, to such persons and events as he sees fit to drag into his service. Of course, some generally-acknowledged truths are here told; for it was impossible for him to avoid it. Alexander, Cleopatra, and others are treated with decency, and generally put into their proper places. But he sees fit to give Antiochus the go-by, and to place others in his stead who are not even hinted at in the vision. The angel came to show Daniel what should befall *his people* in the latter days, and our author suddenly drags in the pope of Rome and Bonaparte, to enact their several parts in company with Antiochus, Cleopatra, Alexander, and the king of Egypt. Let the reader turn to Maccabees, and make himself familiar with the history of Antiochus, who ordered the idol of Jupiter Olympus to be set up in the sanctuary of the Jewish temple, and then judge whether the following verse does not apply to him, (Dan. xi. 31) :

And arms shall stand on his part, and they shall pollute the sanctuary of strength, and shall take away the daily sacrifice, and they shall place the abomination that maketh desolate.

Again, Dan. xi. 28: "Then shall he return into his land with great riches; and his heart shall be against the holy covenant; and he shall do exploits, and return to his own land."

This is probably Antiochus; but, in order to accommodate the text to Octavius Caesar, the author says, --

Then Octavius returned to Rome. And the next exploit (!) that this fourth kingdom would do, would be against the holy covenant. They, by their authority, crucified our Saviour, persecuted the saints, and destroyed Jerusalem; and this fills up the acts of this pagan history until towards the close of the reign of the pagan beast.

So these are the *exploits* of Octavius Caesar, for only one person is spoken of in the text; and, in order to make these exploits as imposing as possible, it is necessary to term the crucifixion of the Saviour *an exploit*, and to lay the act at the door of Octavius Caesar, or the Roman emperor at least. This is too much: this is too great an insult to the understanding of the reader. Jesus Christ was crucified under the authority of Pontius Pilate, but sorely against the wishes of the governor, and because he was compelled to assent by the Jews. But is this brought in proof that the heart of Octavius Caesar was against the holy covenant? It is true, that at a subsequent day, Jerusalem was besieged and finally destroyed by the Romans; but what has all this to do with Octavius Caesar, or with the text? And is this the way that the destruction of the world in 1843 is to be proved? But the very next verse says: "At the time appointed, he shall return and come toward the south; but it shall not be as the former, or as the latter."

The latter part of this verse has been translated, -- "But the latter time shall not be as the former;" and this verse is evidently a continuation of the history of the same man -- Antiochus; and this last verse alludes to the fact that the Roman ambassadors, with

**Popilius, came in galleys, and obliged him to depart out of Egypt. But our author takes a *slide*, or a *stride*, and suddenly places us at the end of the 666 years. Hear this outrageous man:**

He shall return, and come towards the south, "not as the former or the latter." Not Romans going into Egypt, the latter; nor the Syrians going into Egypt, the former; *but Italy must take her turn to be overrun by the northern barbarians.*

**The reader will agree with me, that our author might well hang up his fiddle on this peg; *as the world is safe* from this moment. But he has gone farther, and we must follow him. But how has he come to the sage conclusion noticed above? It is built upon the simple fact that the verse commences with these words, -- "At the time appointed."**

**Of course this means that, at the appointed time, this victorious tyrant should receive a check. But our gentleman has a certain theory to establish, and "Fortune favors those who dare." A more daring commentator has not risen up in these latter days; for he places common sense at defiance.**

**This jump has brought our author directly into St. Peter's chair at Rome. I am not surprised at this great hurry to get there: His claim of infallibility entitles him to the seat.**

Verse 30. For the ships of Chittim shall come against him; therefore he shall be grieved, and return, and have indignation against the holy covenant: so shall he do; he shall even return, and have intelligence with them that forsake the holy covenant.

**Now this is elsewhere written, -- "And the galleys and the Romans shall come upon him"; alluding to the fact that Antiochus was compelled to leave Egypt by the Roman ambassadors, who came in galleys. But, in pursuance with his plan, our author places these transactions in the year 447 after Christ, and makes the latter part of this verse to allude to the persecution of the Christians by the Roman emperors!**

**Next follows, verse 31, -- "And arms shall stand on his part," &c. As I have elsewhere said, he carries this verse up to the papal beast.**

**Our author says:**

But the reign of papacy would not be set up until AD 538, and would end us in the same year, AD 1798, being 1260. This, then, is the history the angel will give us next. Verse 32: "And such as do wickedness against the covenant shall be corrupted by flatterers; but the people that do know their God shall be strong, and do exploits."

**The reader will observe, that, although our author places these events after the coming of Christ, nothing is said by the angel of the new dispensation, or of a new religion of the Jews and the worship of Israel's God, without relation to the Mediator. He explains the last verse which I have quoted:**



The ecclesiastical historians tell us that, in the beginning of the sixth century, about AD 538, a number of writers in that day undertook to prove that the papal chair, together with councils of his approval, were infallible, and their laws were binding on the whole church. Those writers were highly honored, and flattered with promotion by the reigning powers. While, on the other hand, there were many who opposed this power of the pope and clergy, who were denounced as schismatics and Arians, and driven out of the kingdoms under the control of the Romish church.

We beg the reader first to read the verse, and then his explanation, and see if ten thousand better ones could not be *invented*. But we have some observations to make on Miller's last quoted words.

There were, indeed, several writers in the Christian church about the time mentioned by Miler; but the honors and rewards that they obtained were few and far between. That writers flourished any more in or very near the year 538 than they had done long before and long after, and indeed throughout all the early ages of the church, is a mere pretense; and all the members of the church who did write, of course upheld the doctrines of their church against the various opinions which were continually broached by surrounding controversialists. For instance, about the year 510, Fulgentius wrote a confutation of Arianism. He also wrote against the Pelagians and Nestorians; and such was the character of the works put forth in those days, works which we make no doubt Mr. M. would himself have approved. But it is surprising -- if, indeed, any thing could surprise us when coming from him -- that he should pretend the councils were not regarded as infallible until about the year 538. All this is said in order to make his figures come out right, and to make it appear that the papal beast did not begin to roar until such a time as he is ready to exhibit him. How can he pretend that the authority of these councils was not acknowledged till 538, when the council of Nice was held in A. D. 325, and promulgated the famous *Nicene Creed*, without which promulgation, and its reception by the church, Mr. Miller himself might have been a Unitarian?

Nor need we stop at the Nicene council of 325. We read, Acts xv. of the first general council in the church, and that council was regarded as infallible; or if it was not so, then Mr. Miller must not take the Bible for his rule of faith. We find, in chap. xv. that Paul and Barnabus disputed with certain Jewish interlopers who contended for circumcision. The brethren were divided in their minds, and did not surrender up their right of private judgment even to the inspired St. Paul. Therefore Paul and Barnabus were sent up to Jerusalem to hold a council with the apostles and elders. No sooner had they reached Jerusalem, than there rose up certain believing Pharisees, who contended with them as the people at Antioch had done, saying it was necessary for the Gentiles to be circumcised and to keep the law of Moses. So we read that "the apostles and elders came together to consider this matter." After there had been much disputing, Peter arose and gave his opinion, in general terms, that the Gentiles should not be burdened with the yoke which neither themselves nor their fathers had been able to bear. Then Barnabus and Paul gave an account of their labors among the Gentiles; and James, referring to the opinion of Peter, draws up a particular form of expression to be adopted by the council. It received their approval, and they accordingly wrote to the brethren at Antioch, saying, "For it seemed

good to the Holy Ghost and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things," &c.

At this council were assembled several of the inspired apostles, and a greater number of the elders and brethren, who had been converted by their preaching, and their decision was the decision of the church and of the Holy Ghost. Yet Mr. Miller pretends that these councils commenced in 538, in order to make his reckoning good.

He goes on as far as the 39th verse, applying this part of the chapter, which alludes to *Antiochus Epiphanes*, to the papal beast; and the manner in which he finds out resemblances would be extremely edifying in a buffoon, but is a criminal burlesque on holy Scripture, and stamps the author a man run mad with bigotry.

Where it is said of Antiochus that "he shall speak marvelous things against the god of gods" -- meaning by this last term the God of Israel -- our author applies the prophecy to papal Rome; whereas it is notorious that blasphemy against the Supreme Being, or even against the apostles or saints, is regarded with horror by that people.

Where it says, "Neither shall he regard the God of his fathers," meaning that Antiochus should even lack heathen piety, and should assume to introduce new gods, our author applies it to the Catholics who do not regard the pagan deities, for he says the pagans were *their fathers*!

He says the pope of Rome claims to be "God on earth"; which pope, as is well known, during some parts of the service smites his breast, and calls on God to be merciful to him a sinner, and asks the prayers of the people that he may be saved from his sins. In a letter to Bonaparte, in reply to some offers of favor from that emperor, the pope wrote: "As for myself, I am but dust and ashes; but the religion which I profess will exist and prosper when you are lying low in your grave," or words to that effect.

When it is said of Antiochus that he should honor the God of forces -- meaning the god *Maozim*, who was the god of forces or strong-holds -- our author brings the expression to bear upon the fact that the pope has a guard, in his capacity of temporal prince, or, in other words, that he upholds civil institutions and the laws. He also states that the pope has had, for ages past, large armies at his command.

And a god whom his fathers knew not shall he honor with gold, and silver, and precious stones, and pleasant things.

This is spoken literally of Antiochus's fathers; but our author goes back some centuries to pagan Rome, to find the fathers of the Christian Romans among the pagans; and this *god that they worship* turns out to be the virgin Mary, or rather the images of Christ, apostles, virgin Mary, and canonized saints. It appears, then, that this *god* must be not only a trinity, but must be composed of a thousand persons, all in one.

Whoever looks on the statue of Washington in the state-house must be callous indeed, if some interesting recollections, some patriotic emotions, are not awakened by the sight of it; and whoever can look on a picture or collection of statues representing some interesting portion of Scripture history and does not feel a still more sacred emotion, is either a stupid fellow, destitute of all taste for the fine arts, or one who cannot be interested by reading of the same thing in the Bible. Pictures and statues impress the mind more powerfully than printed books, and are excellent aids to piety. Whoever reads an account of the crucifixion of our Saviour, immediately forms a picture of the scene in mind; else he could not form an idea of the facts related. A skillful and devout men of genius may draw a still better picture than that which he had formed in his mind. If he reverences the Bible which relates the story, he must reverence the picture or statues which relate the same story. But let us illustrate this in another way. Suppose that the reader should see St. Paul as live and in the body; would he look upon the man with veneration? You answer, *yes*. But why should you do so? For that which you see is not his soul; it is mere perishable dust and ashes, and no better than wood or stone. But you look upon his outward form with reverence on account of the soul connected with it. Even so you may look upon images or pictures with reverence on account of the sacred idea connected with them; and not because you venerate the paint, the canvass, the wood, or the stone. This is the whole secret of that *image worship* about which the wretched persecutors of modern times are bawling at their revival meetings and elsewhere.

So much for *the strange god* of Mr. Miller.

I have not noticed all the objectionable parts of the lecture, nor is it my object to do so; nor is it necessary; for, if it can be shown that the author is at fault in his calculations, it may suffice to preserve the senses of some luckless being who might otherwise be deluded by him.

## CHAPTER VII.

The seventh lecture opens with the following text:

Dan. xii. 8. And I heard, but I understood not: then said I, O my Lord, what shall be the end of these things?

It is a singular fact that some men prefer intricate error to plain truth: they are determined to make mysteries where all is simple and easy. The term *mystery Babylon* may well be applied to this strange author. We have seen, in the preceding lecture, how he has endeavored to apply the prophecy which gives the history of one man, in the most regular and consecutive manner, to a multitude of events with which the text has no natural connection. Such is still the plan which he is pursuing in the present lecture. We shall

remark upon this in place, but must now follow the author into the twelfth chapter, whither he has gone on an expedition to bring up one of his arguments.

After quoting the verse at the head of this chapter, in which we learn that Daniel declared his inability to understand the vision, Mr. Miller undertakes to give us the reason that Daniel could not understand it. He says:

Previous to Daniel's asking the question contained in our text, he had been taught, as we have seen in our former lecture, not only the history of future events as they would succeed each other down to the end of the world, (!) but he had the regular order of time specified in the duration of the little horn, -- '*time, times, and a half*,' as in Dan. vii. 25, and xii. 7. But he had been informed of many events which should transpire after his '*time, times, and a half*' should be finished, and, not having the length of the pagan beast or daily abominations given to him at all, he could not tell or understand whereabouts in his great number of 2300 days the end of the civil power of the little horn, or papal Rome, carried him. There was no rule given Daniel yet by which he could tell when or how long after the crucifixion of the Messiah before the daily sacrifice abomination would be taken out of the way, and the power of the little horn be established, and the abomination of desolation set up. Be sure, Daniel had heard the whole history down to the resurrection, and had the whole vision specified in his 2300 days. But as he saw there were evidently three divisions of the time after the crucifixion or cutting off of the Messiah at the fulfillment of his 490 years, which would be the remainder of his total number of 2300 years after his 70 weeks should be fulfilled. And having only 1260 of those years accounted for by the reign of his little horn, leaving 550 years to be applied on the pagan beast and for the events which we are to attend to after the papal beast lost his civil power. Therefore the propriety of Daniel's saying in our text, "Then I heard, but I understood not." He understood not how this time was divided, and especially how much time would be taken up in the last division of the angel's history, beginning with the fortieth verse of the 11th chapter, where our last lecture ended, and finishing with the context of the 12th chapter, and the verse previous to our text.

The reader will now perceive how our author has divided the time; that is, the whole 2300 years which transpired after the order was given to build Jerusalem. As a maker of almanacs, Mr. Miller would be preeminent; but, as a commentator, he is woefully at fault, being led more by his passions and prejudices than by reason and candor. The reader now knows the reason that Daniel did not understand the vision; and it must be confessed that no man with less intellect and ingenuity than our author could possibly have understood it as he does.

Whether Mr. Miller's calculations are correct or not depends wholly upon the propriety of his divisions, and on the correctness of his application of the prophecies. We are soon to see poor Napoleon stretched upon his rack and brutally murdered; torn joint by joint, in order to accommodate him to Scripture -- a most unscriptural character, truly, to be served up in this way.

With regard to this division of time I shall have to request the reader to turn to the 11th chapter of Daniel, and the 21st verse, commencing, "And in his estate shall stand up a vile person." With this verse commences the future history of *Antiochus Epiphanes*, and his history is continued regularly to the end of the chapter. Yet our author attributes a part of his exploits to the pagan Romans, a part of them to papal Rome, and a part of them to Bonaparte. It is necessary to point out where these divisions are made, that the reader may see there is no such change of characters and scenery in the history itself, and that the

whole is meant to apply to but one individual. We will just notice, however, the places across which Miller builds his Virginia fences.

Verse 21. And in his estate shall stand up a vile person, to whom they shall not give the honor of his kingdom; but he shall come in peaceably, and obtain the kingdom by flatteries.

Verse 22. And with the arms of a flood shall they be overthrown from before him, and shall be broken; yea, also the prince of the covenant.

Thus the reader will find, by reference to the chapter, that the narrative goes on until we arrive at the 28th verse:

Then shall he return into his land with great riches, and his heart shall be against the holy covenant; and he shall do exploits, and return to his own land.

Verse 29. At the time appointed he shall return and come toward the south; but it shall not be as the former, or as the latter.

This last clause, of course, means that now he shall not carry everything before him, as he has done, but that he shall meet with a check. Hence the verse begins, "at the appointed time," i.e. the item to change his successes into defeats.

But our author draws a line between the 28th and 29th verses.

The first part of the 28th verse he applies to Octavius Caesar; but, being in a hurry to build his fence, makes the rest of the verse apply to all the acts of pagan Rome, until the end of the 666 years. Therefore here is one of his divisions. Here is the end of pagan Rome. Then he takes up the 29th verse, evidently applying to the same individual whose history has been delineated, and says, verse 29, "He shall return and come towards the south, not as the former or the latter." And here he continues his explanation, that Italy herself is to be overrun. He now sets up the papal beast. Let us point out the line of demarcation:

Verse 31. And arms shall stand on his part, and they shall pollute the sanctuary of strength, and shall take away the daily sacrifice, and they shall place the abomination that maketh desolate.

Verse 32. And such as do wickedly against the covenant shall be corrupt by flatteries; but the people that so know their God shall be strong and do exploits.

Our author ends the reign of the pagan beast at the close of the 31st verse; and, between the 31st and the 32d he places thirty years, in order to bring in some writers who, he says, flattered the pope and clergy about the year 538. Of course, the passage means nothing of the kind; but 538 is the number which he stands in need of, in order to make his reckoning good. He says that the last of the ten horns was converted to Christianity in 508; but that, if he could end the pagan beast there, it will not reconcile the two statements respecting the taking away the daily abomination and setting up the abomination which maketh desolate, and that the time in which the savage beast should continue to reign, unless he allows an

interim of 30 years. No one will object to that; for, after the pagan best is dead, it must require some time to take off his hide and cut him up.

We are now prepared for the bringing in of Napoleon. We left off at the 32d verse of the chapter, which chapter goes on to describe the history of one individual; and we have read that "at the time appointed," he met with a reverse, and was obliged to return from Egypt, and he now stirs himself up against the holy covenant, profanes the temple at Jerusalem, and persecutes the faithful, and then we arrive at the 35th verse:

And some of them of understanding shall fall, to try them, and to purge, and to make them white, even to the time of the end; because it is yet for a time appointed.

This is in the time appointed; but we find there is to be a "time of the end," when he shall be prostrate, and shall perish miserably.

The prophecy continues on to the 39th verse:

Thus shall he do in the most strong holds with a strange god, whom he shall acknowledge and increase with glory; and he shall acknowledge and increase with glory; and he shall cause them to rule over many, and shall divide the land for gain.

Verse 40. And at the time of the end, shall the king of the south push at him; and the king of the north shall come against him like a whirlwind, with chariots, and with horsemen, and with many ships; and he shall enter into the countries, and shall overflow and pass over.

Our author makes the 39th verse find the pope of Rome in full blossom, and pursuing his career at the top of his bent; and at the beginning of the 40th verse, we pop suddenly upon the year 1798, and upon Napoleon Bonaparte. The papal beast has held civil sway for the space of 1260 years, and now is "the time of the end" of that beast, agreeing with the commencement of the 40th verse. Our author says that this year, 1798, is the very year in which the French destroyed the power of the pope. We have now got within 45 years of the end of the world, consequently the plot thickens.

Our author dogmatizes thus:

At this time, then, our prophecy begins, and Bonaparte is the person designated by the pronouns *he* and *him* in the prophecy: "And at the time of the end shall the king of the south push at him; and the king of the north shall come against him like a whirlwind, with chariots, and with horsemen, and with many ships."

Our author thus makes the application:

"This is a description of an alliance entered into by the king of Sardinia, Italy, and Spain, in the south, and Great Britain in the north, for six years," to prosecute the war against Napoleon; and then our author goes into the particulars of the league.

But we beg the reader to look over the 39th and 40th verses, and decide whether they are not part of the history of one individual. Nothing has been said of another person, and to

what nouns do the pronouns *he* and *him* refer, if a new character has just been introduced? Is there an angel among the host of heaven who would not be ashamed to outrage grammar in this manner? Who can hope that this poor old earth will die with decency, if she is to be burned up in the face of such grammar as this! When angels begin to talk in this manner, I shall myself, begin to think that the world is coming to an end. According to Miller, as a signal of the approaching end of the Roman beast, certain princes will push at Bonaparte, and come against him with ships and chariots.

After saying that Napoleon made himself master of almost all that belonged to the western empire of Rome except Great Britain, our author quotes again from the Scriptures: Verse 41. "He shall enter also into the glorious land, and many shall be overthrown; but these shall escape out of his hand, even Edom, and Moab, and the chief of the children of Ammon."

Upon this verse, our author has the hardihood to remark, that "the glorious land" *no doubt* means Italy.

The reader will bear in mind that the angel is giving the history of Antiochus -- a man who could eat nearly half an ox at a time, and who never heard of frog soup in his life; and in order to show the treachery of our author, we have only to turn back to the 16th verse of the chapter which we are now examining which reads:

But he that cometh against him shall do according to his own will, and none shall stand before him; and he shall stand in THE GLORIOUS LAND, which by his hand shall be consumed.

Here the words *glorious land* are undoubtedly applied to Judea, and can have no relation to Italy; and the reader will also perceive, throughout, that the king of the north and the king of the south are constantly spoken of, and cannot allude to the kings of England and the princes of Sardinia, Italy, and Spain.

The verse continues -- "And many countries shall be overthrown." This very *definite* statement is, of course, applicable to Napoleon, as well as to Antiochus. But we also learn -- "But these shall escape out of his hands, even Edom, and Moab, and the chief of the children of Ammon."

Upon this our commentator remarks:

Bonaparte, when he went into Egypt, calculated to march into the East Indies: he advanced into Syria, where, after gaining some advantages, he received a decisive check before St. John d'Acre, when he was obliged to raise the siege, and retreat back to Egypt with the shattered remains of his army. So the country, once inhabited by the Edomites, Moabites, and Ammonites "escaped out of his hands."

After this, who can doubt that Bonaparte is the man pointed out by the angel? Suppose an editor should publish in his paper an account of the execution of Mr. Miller for stealing a horse, and Mr. Miller were to present himself alive before the editor, and demand his motive for thus *lifting him up before the public*; and suppose the editor should say -- "It

matters not; there was a man who once resided where you do that was hanged for delivering a stable of its contents"; would Mr. M. be satisfied?

Verse 42. He shall stretch forth his hands also upon the countries; and Egypt shall not escape.

Verse 43. But he shall have power over the treasures of gold, and of silver, and over all the precious things of Egypt.

Our author says that Napoleon conquered all Lower Egypt; and "levied contributions upon the inhabitants of the country sufficient to support and pay his troops, and brought away much with him." But that is not the account given in the text, which applies to a very different individual.

And the Libyans and Ethiopians shall be at his steps.

Our author says:

When he first went into Egypt, he landed his army in the coast of what was anciently called Lybia, and his last battle was fought in Upper Egypt, what the ancients called Ethiopia. So both of these places were at his steps, although neither of them was fairly conquered, as was Egypt.

Verse 44. But the tidings out of the east and out of the north shall trouble him.

Our author says this alludes to the *holy alliance* which was composed of most of the kings on the north and on the east of France.

I recollect that, when a lad, I was at the museum, attended by several old gentlemen. One of them suddenly said to another, as he pointed at a piece of plank to which an explanatory card was nailed: "See! this is a piece of the ship Endeavor, in which Captain Cook sailed around the world." The old gentleman to whom these words were addressed looked at the block, tapped it with his cane, and dryly remarked -- "Well, I suppose it will answer for that as well as for anything else."

Our author continues:

The news of this alliance caused him much trouble, and also his immediate return to France. "Therefore he shall go forth with great fury to destroy, and utterly to make away many." This is a plain description of Bonaparte's campaign into Russia. He went forth with an army of 400,000 men, with fury, in order to break up the holy alliance. He did utterly destroy Moscow, and laid desolate the country through which he passed. He made away with more than two hundred thousand of his own army, besides the destruction of his enemies, say many thousands more. Such a destruction of life and property, in one campaign, was never known since the days of the Persians and the Greeks.

But your great conflagration will exceed that of Moscow.

Verse 45. And he shall plant the tabernacles of his palace between the seas, in the glorious holy mountain (or "mountain of delight," our author adds).



**He says:**

This was literally fulfilled in May 26, 1805, when Bonapart was crowned king of Italy at Milan, Italy lying between two seas.

"The glorious holy mountain" is, of course, the same spoken of by the prophets, as "nothing shall harm in all thy holy mountain;" "Let us go up into the mountain to pray," &c. And in this instance it alludes to the fact, that Antiochus should reign over Israel and defile the true worship with his false gods. The expression applied to Italy, would have been perfectly unintelligible to Daniel.

"Yet he shall come to his end," with a dose of poison; but that is probably a fabrication. It is no unusual thing for great men to come to their end in the manner mentioned in this verse. Darius, Julius Caesar, Balthazzar, Charles I, Louis XVI, and a host of others who might be mentioned, together with Antiochus, who repented and died in despair of God's mercy, being cut off by loathsome disease, might lay claim to the above quotation from holy writ.

Our gentleman concludes his history of Napoleon -- which, after all, contains fewer lines lies than Sir Walter Scott's -- with the following pious observations:

By this history, the kings of the earth may learn that God can, with perfect ease, when the set time shall come, break them and their kingdoms to pieces, so that the wind may carry them away like chaff, that no place shall be found for them.

This is certainly a very valuable piece of information; but as the kings who peruse Mr. Miller's book are likely to be scarce, we fear it will prove like precious ointment spilt upon the ground.

**Our author goes on:**

I shall now examine the remainder of Gabriel's message, contained in Dan. xiii. i : "And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great Prince, which standth for the children of thy people." Michael, in this passage, must mean Christ; he is the great Prince, and Prince of princes.

It means no such thing. The text does not call him the "Prince of princes," but the Prince of Israel, or Daniel's people. It is the same Michael of whom St. Jude speaks, and who was acknowledged by the Jews as the guardian angel of the church.

Jude, verse 9. Yet Michael, the archangel, when contending with the devil, (he disputed about the body of Moses,) durst not bring against him a railing accusation; but said, The Lord rebuke thee.

**Our author says of this time, when Michael shall stand up for the people of Judea --**

The time here spoken of is when Bonaparte shall come to his end, and none to help him. This was in the latter part of AD 1815.

If Bonaparte had not been a special favorite of our author, he would doubtless have made Lord Wellington personate the archangel. We wonder he did not tell us that in the year 1815 the war between England and the United States was brought to a close. But let us follow him further, and we shall learn how Michael stood up for Daniel's people:

There are two things for which Christ [Michael] *stands up* for his people to accomplish; one is their faith, and the other their judgment. Jer. iii. 13. Now it is evident he did not then stand up in judgment; therefore I shall choose the former, that he stood up to plead the cause of his people, to restrain backsliders, and to add to the church of God many who should be saved.

Here we see the great object of Miler's book -- the promotion of sectarian revivals, and other fanatical enterprises. But what is the true meaning of the text. I should conjecture that it alluded to the death of Antiochus, the consequent relief from bitter persecution, and the great victory of Judas Machabeus over the enemies of Israel, and especially over Nicanor; for the head of that enemy was hung up" as an evident and manifest sign of the help of God," and it was ordained by a common decree, to solemnize the day in which that victory was won; for we read that, from that time, the city was occupied by the Hebrews.

But our author, with his usual eagle gaze, sees much farther. We will continue his remarks:

And, blessed be his holy name, he accomplished his purpose; for, in the years 1816, 17, 18, more people were converted to the faith of Jesus than had been for 30 years before. Almost, and I know not but every town in these States was visited with a shower of mercy, and hundreds and thousands, yea, tens of thousands, were born into the invisible kingdom of the dear Redeemer, and their names recorded among the members of the church of the first-born.

How religion thrived about that time I know not. If true religion did then increase, to God be the praise. If men and women did, in great measure, cease from their evil works and learn to do well, if they attended steadily to their religious and moral duties, let go their hold upon this vain world and its miserable delights, and engaged in works of charity, in almsgiving, in protecting the stranger and the fatherless, and, in short, in obeying the excellent Epistle of St. James, we ought to be abundantly thankful to the giver of every good and perfect gift. But if our author means that a religious crusade against certain doctrines was waged, that those men who had been engaged in the war, and had spent several years in the camp, felt disinclined to labor, and that many of them took up the business of itinerant preaching, and went yelling and caterwauling through the country, as if to scare away the devil by acclamation, then do I think that he has pressed the holy archangel into a service to which he was never inclined. Every rational person knows that those religious excitements, as falsely termed, result in no good. They do not purify the heart, and lay the foundation of abiding faith and good works. Weak women and excitable men are carried away by those tempests of fanaticism, and talk religiously for a few weeks or months, become puffed up with an idea of their own holiness, and then sink down into apathy or infidelity. There can be little doubt that those persons who are so constituted that they can scarcely live, except like the salamander, in a continual heat, felt the want of some new impetus at the conclusion of the wars in Europe and Canada; and, as the fire and brimstone of hell bears some resemblance to gunpowder flashes, they very easily exchanged

the latter for the former, and embraced with open arms those ranting itinerants who would paint the horrors of perdition in the most glowing terms.

Our gentleman himself furnishes us with a sample of this kind of declamation, in his eleventh lecture; and I will insert it here, lest the reader should accidentally lose the benefit of it, through my negligence:

But you, O impenitent man or woman, where will you be then? When heaven shall resound with the mighty song, and distant realms shall echo back the sound, where, tell me, where will you be then! *In hell!* oh think! *In hell!* a dreadful word! Once more, think! *In hell!* lifting up your eyes, being in torment. Stop, sinner, think! *In hell!* where shall be weeping, wailing, and gnashing of teeth. Stop, sinner, stop; consider on your latter end. *In hell!* where the beast and false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night forever and ever.' I entreat of you to think. *In hell!*

I know you hate to hear the word. It sounds too harsh. There is no music in it. You say it grates upon the ear. But think, when it grates upon the soul, the conscience, and the ear, and not by sound only, but a dread reality, when there can be no respite, no cessation, no deliverance, no hope! You will then think, yes, of this warning, of a thousand others, perhaps of this hour, with many more that are lost; yes, worse than lost, that have been squandered in earthly, vain, and transitory mirth, have been abused; for there have been many hours the Spirit strove with you, and you prayed to be excused. There was an hour when conscience spake, but you stopped your ears and would not hear. There was a time when judgment and reason whispered, but you soon drowned their cry by calling in some aid against your better part. To judgment and reason you have opposed *will* and *wit*, and then, *in hell*, was only *in the grave*. In this vain citadel, on this frail house of sand, you will build, until the last seal is broken, the last trump will sound, the last ave pronounced, and the last vial be poured upon the earth. Then, penitent man or woman, you will awake in everlasting woe.

He then goes on to exhort the sinner to join the church immediately; for he says -- "Then come in God's appointed way, (!!!) repent. Do you want a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens? Then join, in heart and soul, this happy people, whose God is the Lord."

Let me now ask the reader if it be possible, that a man who speaks flippantly -- nay, triumphantly -- of the awful perdition of his fellow-sinners, ever knew anything of true religion. Was *his* heart ever imbued with the charity of the gospel? Never! Such a man would rejoice, Nero-like, while the world was in a blaze. Amid the dreadful screams and shrieks of despairing souls, he would clap his hands for joy. Wretched man! smite your own breast, and with your mouth prostrate in the dust, ask of God that mercy which you rejoice to believe will be withheld from others. St. Paul acknowledged himself to be the chief of sinners, while you, like the proud Pharisee, thank God that you are better than other men. Remember the man who made the brazen bull; he was the first whose vain roarings came from its mouth.

Our author goes on to speak of the wonderful spread of religion, and also boasts of those miserable hypocrites who have gone out as missionaries, making their converts "ten times more the child of hell" than they were before. These pestilential fellows have gone through the world like roaring lions, seeking whom they devour, teaching the simple savage -- who is an angel of light when compared with themselves -- that God damned them before the

world was created, and that therefore they ought to repent, and return to this *most merciful Being!*

The gentleman again quotes from the Scripture:

And there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time; and at that time, thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book.

This probably alludes to the awful persecutions of Antiochus, which should be brought to an end when Michael stood up for the faithful Jews: many of the Jews suffered the most cruel martyrdom; and many went into caves, sepulchers, and holes of the earth to celebrate the Sabbath, or to circumcise their children, as they were sure of a cruel death if discovered in worshipping the God of Israel, according to the law of Moses. Many that were cruelly put to death most firmly resisted the tyrant and his decrees, among whom were women and little children.

Our author takes a different view of the text:

This time of trouble is yet in futurity; but is hanging, as it were, over our heads, ready to break upon us in tenfold vengeance, when the angel of the gospel, who is now flying through the midst of heaven, shall seal the last child of God in their foreheads. And when the four angels who are now holding the four winds, that it blow not on the sea nor on the land, shall cease their holding; when the angel standing on the sea and land shall lift his hand to heaven and swear, by him that liveth forever and ever, that time shall be no longer, or, as it might and perhaps ought to have been translated, "that there shall be no longer delay!" That is, God would wait no longer for repentance, no longer to be gracious; but his Spirit would take its flight from the world, and the grace of God would cease to restrain men. He that is filthy will be filthy still. Mankind will for a short season give loose to all the corrupt passions of the human heart. No laws, human or divine, will be regarded; all authority will be trampled underfoot; anarchy will be the order of governments, and confusion fill the world with horror and despair. Murder, treason, and crime, will be common law, and division and disunion the only bond of fellowship. Christians will be persecuted unto death, and dens and caves of the earth will be their retreat. All things which are not eternal will be shaken to pieces, that that which cannot be shaken may remain.

The author here mentions the time when he imagined these events would take place; but as I understand this arose from a trifling error in his calculations, which he has since rectified, it would of course be unfair to taunt him with his mistake; but the dreadful events he here pictured out answer very well, with a few exceptions, to the time of Antiochus's persecutions, and to which the prophecy evidently refers. As the world has been so long resting in comparative tranquillity, it would not be surprising, if war should break out soon in some quarter; but I trust the reader will not suffer himself to be alarmed, though he should hear of "wars and rumors of wars." I have a better opinion of my fellow-men than to suppose they will so soon become murderers, traitors, thieves, and robbers; and trust Mr. Miller will never have the opportunity to gloat on such horrid spectacle as his dark extravagant imagination has conjured up. Perhaps we are not sufficiently sensible of God's mercy to such unworthy sinners as we are, in giving us seed time and harvest, winter and summer, and, above all, such political blessings as our revolutionary fathers could hardly have hoped for, in their most sanguine moments. These mercies, instead of puffing us up, should inspire us with humility, when we contrast the continued bounties of the

great Shepherd with our own poor merits. Our ingratitude is such that we should have no right to complain, even if Heaven visited us with all those plagues; yet I do not think he will do it for Mr. Miller's individual gratification.

Verse 2. And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.

Some commentators have accommodated these things to antichrist, who, they say, shall come in the end of the world. I am rather inclined to believe that the angel is speaking of the time of Antiochus and the wars of Judas Machabeus. Read the Saviour's account of the destruction of Jerusalem, in which he says, (Matt. xxiv. 15)

When ye, therefore, shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place, [alluding to the setting up of the heathen image in the temple, and the standards of the soldiers in the time of Antiochus, of which the Roman sacrileges would be an imitation,] then let them which be in Judea flee into the mountains: let him which is on the house-top not come down to take any thing out of his house; neither let him which is in the field return back to take his clothes, &c. *For then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time; [and then he adds] no, nor shall ever be.*

But the angel Gabriel does not say, when speaking of the times of Antiochus, "*nor shall ever be.*" He simply says, "*such as never was since there was a nation even to that time.*"

The time of which Gabriel prophesied was not to be like the troubles at the destruction of Jerusalem, and the troubles which pursued the Jews for many centuries afterward; nevertheless, they were horrible enough to satisfy anybody but our author.

Thus we have compared the first verse of the chapter with the Saviour's account of the troubles to come upon Jerusalem; and now let us speak of those who, the angel said, should awake from the dust of the earth.

We read, in the 10th verse of the same chapter,

Many shall be purified, and made white, and tried; but the wicked shall do wickedly: and none of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand.

Now, in the time of Antiochus's persecutions, there were some who became corrupted, and joined with the idolaters; but others remained steadfast, and these were tried as in a fire, and purified by their sufferings. Accordingly, when their tribulations were removed by the death of Antiochus and the victory of Machabeus, they came up out of the dust, into which they had been crushed, filled with joy, and faith, and hope; which is termed everlasting life in the Scriptures. "He that believeth on the Son *hath* everlasting life." "This is eternal life, to know thee," &c. But those who had yielded in the time of trouble and temptation, came forth with shame, and subject to everlasting contempt.

Hence the angel says:

And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.

Verse 3. And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars forever and ever.

Of course this *awakening from the dust* cannot allude to the general resurrection, as it says that "many" shall awake. Some may choose to interpret the passage, that those who were slain in battle, or put to death for their adherence to the religion of their nation, would awake in the future state of existence, and there receive the meed of their deservings.

Daniel did not understand the vision; and the angel told him the words were "closed up and sealed until the time of the end," like the sealed book in Revelations, which none but the lion of the tribe of Judah could open. Since those prophecies have all been fulfilled, and "the time of the end" has long gone by, the seal is removed.

"At the time of the end many shall run to and fro." This is attributed, by our author, to steamboats, railroads, the Great Western, and the many recent inventions to expedite travel.

"And knowledge shall be increased." "This," our author says, "is literally fulfilled." But in what age of the world was it not fulfilled? The invention of printing, the discovery of America, Newton's discoveries, and those of Galileo, give celebrity to former ages, greater than that which we can claim. It is true, we have phrenology, and some other futile inventions, together with many improvements in the arts; but the world is always discovering or inventing something new. It may be doubted whether there is more sound knowledge among men now than there was in former ages of the world. Our learning is, for the most part, superficial, when compared to that of former days.

With regard to "running to and fro," I wonder our author had not introduced the treadmill as an illustration of his argument. People in this country thought they were running to and fro at a prodigious rate, when the mail was two weeks between Boston and New York; and it is possible that, in one hundred years from this time, our posterity will, in turn, laugh at us as a generation of snails. No doubt people in all ages have thought that they lived in a day of immense traveling; and every new improvement, in vehicles or packets, was regarded as a prodigy.

Doubtless, in the end of the persecutions which we have related, those who had hidden themselves in holes and crannies came out and avenged themselves for lost time, by stirring among their friends and in the neighboring countries; and, as Judas Machabeus made a covenant with the Romans about this time, with whom the Jews were previously but little acquainted, it is probable that much knowledge came through them to the people of Judea.

When the inquiry is made, how long before there shall be an end of these wonders? we find, in verse 7, that the angel swore it should be for "*a time, times, and a half.*" How long a time that is I know not; but Miller says it is 1260 days.

I wish the reader to observe that our author has confined the whole of this last chapter to the 45 years preceding the resurrection. Yet here are the 1260 days mentioned which should have preceded the 45 days, (or years, as our author terms them). How, then, does he leap over these bounds, which he cannot pass? It is thus:

But the question, "How long to the end of these wonders?" means, to the end of the reign of the beast which the world wondered after.

On the strength of this one word *wonder*, he rejects the manifest meaning of the text.

The angel says it should be "for a time and times and a half; and when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people."

This probably means that Antiochus should succeed in scattering the power of Daniel's people, and reducing them to subjection before the time of trouble in Judea should take place, and those events just related; and that they should experience deliverance at the end of the time, times, and a half.

After saying that many shall be purified in this furnace of affliction, the angel continues:

Verse 11. And from the time that the daily sacrifice shall be taken away, and the abomination that makes desolate set up, there shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety days.

Our author says that these 1290 days are the 1290 years from the time that the last horn, or pagan king, was converted to Christianity, up to the taking away of the power of the pope by Bonaparte, in 1798.

Thus Mr. Miller makes the plain declaration, that from the time the fire should be taken from the temple, *until* the time that Antiochus should set up the abomination that maketh desolate, or image, in the holy place, should be 1290 days, to mean that from the time paganism is banished out of the Roman empire, *and* the papal beast is set up, *until* the downfall of civil power at Rome, shall be 1290 years. Now it could not be 1290 years from both the downfall of paganism and the beginning of popery, unless our author is willing to throw out his 30 years.

In relation to the scattering of the power of the holy people, our gentleman comments thus:

But the last sign, "the scattering of the holy people," a part of the perilous times. How are they to be scattered? I answer, by the errors of the antichristian abomination, and the lo heres and lo theres; by dividing the people of God into parties, divisions, and subdivisions. And methinks I hear you say, surely these things are already accomplished. Yes, you are right in part, but not to its extent: the sects are all divided now, but not crumbled to pieces; some are divided, but not scattered. The time is soon coming when father will be against son, and son against father. Yea, the sects are divided now. Presbyterians are divided into old and new school, and then again into Perfectionists. Congregationalists are divided between Orthodox and Socinianism, old and new measures, Unionists, &c. Methodists are divided between Episcopal and Protestant. Baptists are divided between old and new measures, antimasons, Campbellites, open and close communion, &c. &c. Quakers are divided between Orthodox and Hicksites. And thus might we go on and name the divisions and subdivisions of all sects who have taken Christ for their captain.

The above is doubtless very true; and I insert it more on account of its truth than for any other reason. A slight error in the beginning, however, mars the beauty of his argument. We read "*the power of the holy people shall be scattered;*" which simply means that the people of Judea should be subdued before they should triumph, and has no more to do with Presbyterians and antimasons than that with the marriage of Queen Victoria.

## CHAPTER VIII.

The eighth lecture of Mr. Miller opens with this text, (Rev. viii. 13):

And I beheld and heard an angel flying through the midst of heaven, saying, with a loud voice, Woe, woe, woe to the inhabitants of the earth, by reason of the other voices of the trumpet of the three angels which are yet to sound.

He says that "*the sounding of trumpets is always used to denote the downfall of some empire, nation, or place, or some dreadful battle which may decide the fate of empires, nations, or places.*" He also says that the four first trumpets "*had their accomplishment in the destruction of the Jews and their dispersion, in the fall of imperial Rome, in the overthrow of the Asiatic kingdom, and in the taking away of pagan rites and ceremonies.*" He therefore supposes that the three last trumpets carry us forward to the end of the world, or to AD 1843. The first four trumpets had their accomplishments under Rome pagan; the last three under Rome papal. He also says,

These three trumpets and three woes are a description of the judgments that God has sent and will send on this papal beast, the abomination of the whole (?) *earth*.

If papal Rome is the abomination of the whole earth, what shall we say of Juggernaut, Mohometanism, and the various superstitions that prevail in the known world? There are about one hundred and sixty millions of Roman Catholics, and about fifty millions belonging to the various Protestant sects. The other eight hundred millions of human beings who inhabit this globe are sunk in various superstitions. Papal Rome cannot therefore be called "*the abomination of the whole earth*"; but, in the days of St. John, Rome, sunk in pagan darkness, persecuting the saints, with her Neros and her Domitians, might well have been called "*the abomination of the whole earth,*" as her power and influence reached very far over the then known world. The Revelations were written sixty-four years after our Lord's ascension, about seven years before the fall of Jerusalem, and about the time that the war commenced which ended in the total rout of its vile inhabitants. St. John, both as a Jew and as a Christian, must have felt very little respect for the tyrannical nation who both worshipped heathen deities and persecuted his countrymen. Hence, when he speaks of the fall of pagan Rome, and of meting out to her the same punishment which she was to inflict upon Jerusalem and upon the Christians, it is



in strong and energetic language. Although Jerusalem was to be punished for her sins, yet the nation which was made use of for her scourge was none the less guilty on that account; even as the Jews who murdered the Lord were none the less guilty on account of the holy purposes which were fulfilled by his death. Therefore the apostle might well term Rome "the abomination of the whole earth."

Our author terms Mahomet "a fallen star," in order to adapt him to the star which fell from heaven to the earth, and to whom was consigned the key of the bottomless pit; but on what authority I know not; for we do not learn that that wretched deceiver was ever remarkable for virtue or piety. In one sense, he was a risen star; but perhaps Miller alludes to his distemper -- the *falling* sickness. We again quote from the work:

The fifth trumpet alludes to the rise of the Turkish empire under Ottoman, at the downfall of the Saracens.

He then speaks of the check which the papal church received from the principles of Mahomet.

Let us briefly notice the manner in which our gentleman applies the prophecies of this chapter:

Rev. ix. 1. "And the fifth angel sounded, and I saw a star fall from heaven unto the earth; and to him was given the key of the bottomless pit." After the downfall of pagan Rome, and the rise of the antichristian abomination, Mahomet promulgated a religion which evidently came from the bottomless pit; for it fostered all the wicked passions of the human heart, such as war, murder, slavery, and lust.

It appears to me that his is too strong language to apply even to Mahometanism; but there is nothing definite here -- nothing that particularly applies to the faith of Mahomet; and to call this impostor a fallen star from heaven is ridiculous in the extreme.

Verse 2. And he opened the bottomless pit, and there arose a smoke out of the pit, as the smoke of a great furnace; and the sun and the air was darkened by reason of the smoke of the pit.

He says the *bottomless pit* denotes the theories and doctrines of men not grounded upon the word of God. According to this explanation, I should rather suppose the star which fell from heaven was some apostate from the true faith, who broached idle doctrines that set men to work in framing creeds, forever changing and never established. He says that *smoke* denotes the errors from such doctrine, which serve to blind the eyes of men that they cannot see the truth; and that, as this was as *the smoke of a great furnace*, it shows the extent to which these false theories should prevail. He says the sun denotes the gospel, and the *air* denotes piety, which gives animation and life to the heart, as air does to the physical system. This may be very ingenious, but does not well apply to Mahometanism, which triumphed over paganism, and crushed, as our author says, the power of the papal beast.

He says that the papal power was checked by Mahometanism, and that the pious influence of the gospel was obstructed by it.

**Verse 3.** And there came out of the smoke locusts upon the earth: and unto them was given power, as the scorpions of the earth have power.

By *locusts* he understands armies, which had the power to furnish the antichristian beast.

**Verse 4.** And it was commanded them that they should not hurt the grass of the earth neither any green thing, neither any tree but only those men which have not the seal of God in their foreheads.

**The author thus cavalierly interprets the verse:**

By grass, green things, and trees, (Ps. lxxii. 6, Hosea xiv. 8,) I understand the true church or people of God. By those men having not the seal of God, &c. I understand the antichristian church, or papal Rome. Then this would be the sense: And it was commanded them that they should not hurt the true church nor people of God, but only the antichristian beast or powers subject to her.

**I desire the reader to bear in mind the above explanation, as I shall soon show how widely our author shoots from the mark, and how he falsifies the plain declarations of history.**

**Verse 5.** And to them it was given that they should not kill them; but that they should be tormented five months and their torment was as the torment of a scorpion when he striketh a man.

**Our author says, to kill is to destroy. Five months is, in prophecy, 150 years and to torment as a scorpion is to make sudden excursions and eruptions into the country; and that this means that Turkish armies would harass and not destroy the papal powers for 150 years. The reader will please bear this in mind.**

**Verse 6.** And in those days shall men seek death and shall not find it, and shall desire to die, and death shall flee from them.

**To which Miller adds:**

About this time the Greek church at Constantinople was so harassed by papal authority that it gave rise to a saying among them, "that they had rather see the Turkish turban on the throne of the Eastern empire than the pope's tiara." And any one who has read the history of the 14th century will see that this text was literally accomplished.

**Yes, Mr. Miller; and so was their wish in respect to the turban; and woeful, indeed, have been the consequences. But it is not probable that such wish was general; neither were they in such distress until the Turks entered Constantinople. There was, indeed, a theological dispute going on between the Western and Eastern churches; but the people were not desirous of dying on that account. Your explanation is puerile in the extreme.**

**Verse 7.** And the shapes of the locusts were like unto horses prepared unto battle; and on their heads were, as it were, crowns like gold, and their faces were as the faces of men.

**Our author says these were the Turkish armies who were all horsemen. He says,**

This was true with the Turks, and no other kingdom since Christ's time, that we have any knowledge of, whose armies were all horsemen. They wore on their heads yellow turbans, which can only apply to the Turks, looking like crowns of gold.

This explanation is ingenious; but burnished helmets, glittering in the sun, might be spoken of as crown's of gold; although it is not probable that the apostle would have so compared them, as helmets were common enough among the warriors in his day. I can hardly believe, however, that the apostle would have said of simple cavalry, with which he was well acquainted, that the scorpions were horses with the faces of men, and that the heads on these horses were crowns of gold. The description appears to me more like a figurative allusion to some wild, lawless bands of uncivilized warriors, of bestial character, very rapid in their assaults, and making themselves masters of the country which they attacked, having faces like men, in almost all respects resembling beasts.

Verse 8. And they had hair as the hair of women, and their teeth were as the teeth of lions!

He says,

They wore long hair attached to their turbans, and they fought with javelins like the teeth of lions.

The apostle could hardly have termed the javelins or darts which they used the teeth of those animals.

Verse 9. And they had breast-plates, as it were breast-plates of iron; and the sound of their wings was as the sound of chariots, of many horses running to battle.

Our author says that by breast-plates he understands shields, which the Turks carried in their battles; and that history informs us they made a noise upon them, when they charged an enemy, like the noise of chariot wheels. Yet the apostle knew what shields were; and why should he call them breast-plates? It is well known that horses wore breast-plates in days of yore, and this is probably the meaning of the text. He says this noise was made by their wings, and not upon their breast-plates.

Verse 10. And they had tails like unto scorpions, and there were stings in their tails, and their power was to hurt men five months.

Our author expounds this verse thus:

The Turkish horsemen had each a scimitar, which hung in a scabbard at their waist, that they used in close combat after they had discharged their javelins, with which they were very expert, severing a man's or even a horse's head at a blow. And from the time that the Ottoman power or Turkish empire was first established in Bythinia, until the downfall of the Greek or Eastern empire, when the Turks took Constantinople, was five prophetic months, or 150 years.

All animals who have stings, have tails in which they are sheathed. But the apostle knew what a scabbard and a sword were. "Put up thy sword into its sheath," said our Lord to Peter while John was present. Neither would the apostle have termed an instrument used

for striking, *a sting*, for that is thrust into the sufferer. Figure to yourself a man brandishing a sting in his hand, high in the air, and smiting off a man's head with it! The idea is forced, strained, and unnatural. These scimitars are particularly intended for striking, and are not at all like the French small sword.

Verse 11. And they had a king over them, which is the angel of the bottomless pit, whose name in the Hebrew tongue is Abaddon, but in the Greek tongue hath his name Apollyon.

Our author says on this point, that the founder and king of the Turkish empire was Othoman of Ottoman, and that great has been the destruction which this government has executed upon the world, and therefore it may well be styled *Destroyer*, which is, in prophecy, the signification of Abaddon or Apollyon. But all this has nothing to do with the text, and throws no light upon it.

Now, I propose to throw out a few remarks which will destroy the premises of our author's reasoning. He says that these Turkish warriors were commanded to hurt no *green thing or tree*, which signify the true church and people of God; but that they were to hurt only such as had not the seal of God in their foreheads. By those who have not the seal of God he understands the Papal church. He then tells us that the Greeks were plagued by these warriors a considerable time, and finally overthrown; that Constantinople was captured, and became a Turkish city. Now how happens it that the enemies of the beast were plagued and tormented, and finally overthrown by these warriors? It is true that they made incursions into Spain, France, and Italy, and committed various excesses. But where do they now triumph, and where have they triumphed for centuries, reducing the inhabitants to a state of slavery? Is not the Eastern church the bondsman of Mahomet? Those faithful and constant followers of the Roman beast, Ferdinand and Isabella, drove the Moors from their dominions, and trampled the crescent under their feet. The Mahometan lies like an incubus on the Greek church, but the Catholic countries have shaken him off like a dew-drop from the lion's mane.

History informs us that the Greek church acknowledged, for the first eight centuries, the supremacy of the Roman pontiff. But one Photius, who was elected patriarch of Constantinople in the year 858, disturbed this order of things; and it is also stated that he was a man of most perverse, insidious, and hypocritical character. Being very ambitious, he desired to reign "alone in his glory," and created a schism. This did not, for some time, dissolve the union between the two churches; but the Greeks gradually altered some part of the creed which they had held for eight centuries in common with their Roman neighbors. Here is a sample of the changes which they made:

1. They condemn the Latins as heretics, for eating things strangled, and such other meats as are prohibited by the Old Testament.
2. They deny that simple fornication is a mortal sin.

3. They insist that it is lawful to deceive an enemy, and that it is no sin to injure and oppress him.

4. They are of the opinion that, in order to be saved, there is no necessity to make restitution of such goods as have been stolen, or fraudulently obtained.

These opinions they have long held, in opposition to the Roman beast, who maintains the contrary. We know the Greeks of latter times to have been great pirates, thieves, and so much meaner than the Turks, that some people have given the latter the preference. We read that, as early as the first part of the seventh century, when the Greeks were harassed and overrun by the Persians, the emperor Heraclius, astonished at their victories, and demanding one day in council what could be the cause, a grave person stood up and said, "It is because the Greeks have dishonored the sanctity of their profession, and no longer retain the doctrine taught by Jesus Christ and his disciples. They insult and oppress one another, live in enmity and dissensions, and are abandoned to the most infamous usuries and lusts."

The schism of Photius gradually gained ground, and many councils were held in order to compare differences; and while the Roman church insisted on their retaining the old system of faith and discipline, the Greeks held out for their new improvements; and although the latter did sometimes return for a short space, yet they as often revolted. Thus things continued until 1451, when Pope Nicholas V wrote them a letter, addressed particularly to the emperor, in which he says,

The Greeks have already too long abused the patience of God, in persisting in their schism. According to the parable of the gospel, God waits to see if the fig-tree, after having been cultivated with so much care, will at last yield fruit; but if it does not, within the space of three years, which God still allows them, [see how the beast and Mr. Miller agree,] the tree will be cut down by the root, and the Greek nation shall be entirely ruined by the ministers of divine vengeance, [here our author and the beast agree again,] which God will send to execute the sentence already pronounced in heaven against them.

It appears, then, that this pope thought the locusts would be let loose upon those who had not the mark of the beast. Mr. Miller thinks they were to be let loose on those who *did* have the mark of the beast. And we must confess that, in this instance, the pope proved himself the true prophet. Now if Mr. Miller cannot prophesy correctly about things which are past, how shall we believe his fish story about the things to come?

About three years after the pope's letter had been written, Mahomet II besieged Constantinople with a land army of 300,000 men, and a fleet of above 100 galleys, with 130 other smaller vessels. According to Phranzes, the Greek historian, the Turks entered the city through a breach which they had made by shooting some stone bullets of two hundred pounds weight from fourteen batteries. The emperor's head was cut off and fixed on a pike; the nobles and grandees were massacred and dissected, and the bodies of the empress and her daughters were commanded to be cut in pieces and served up on dishes at a banquet. 40,000 Greeks perished, and 60,000 were sold as slaves.

Thus fell the Eastern empire, 1123 years after its first establishment. Thus it appears that those who had not the seal of God in their foreheads, and whom God had devoted to destruction, were those who had not had the mark of the beast in the forehead, but who had been for centuries in opposition to the beast, and whom the beast himself had given up and repudiated. The thunder of the Vatican and the lightning of the Turkish artillery, fell together upon the heads of that debauched, mercenary, and false-hearted people. Picart, in his history of manners and customs, says, --

The patriarch of Constantinople assumes the honorable title of *Universal* or *Oecumenical* Patriarch. As he purchases his commission of the grand signior, it may easily be supposed that he makes a tyrannical and simoniacal use of a privilege which he himself holds by simony.

Here, then, it will be observed, that Miller has been directly advocating the cause of the Roman beast, and taking sides with that animal against his inveterate foes.

It is sometimes singular that our author has not applied any of these prophecies to the crusaders, who might much more justly have been compared to armies of locusts, springing suddenly out of the earth, and spreading their devastations far and wide.

Our author says of these things:

And if these things are revealed by God himself unto us, surely no one will dare to say that it is nonessential whether we believe this part of the revealed will of God or not. Shall God speak and man disregard it?

The author's antipathy to the Roman beast appears to arise from the circumstances that he wishes to snatch the diadem of infallibility from the brow of that animal, and place it upon his own.

Far be it from me to decide that these locusts do not figure forth the Turkish armies; but it is not proved by the fact that some resemblances may be traced between them, as may be seen by taking some other persons, and drawing a comparison in the way that Miller has done. Let us take Napoleon's grand army, and apply the prophecy to that:

1. The smoke from the pit, and the locusts coming up in its midst, will apply to the army of Bonaparte enveloped in the smoke of their artillery, with which St. John was unacquainted. The star which fell from heaven to the earth was Bonaparte, who, having commenced as a republican and a violent defender of liberal principles, became the founder of despotism.

2. It was commanded them to hurt no green thing, nor tree, nor the grass of the earth. Accordingly Napoleon had no power over England or America, but plagued the ancient and despotic governments of Europe, destroyed the inquisition, dethroned the pope, and especially harassed the haughty Austrian.

3. To them it was given that they should not kill men, but should torment them five months. After Napoleon had run his course, the Bourbons came back to the throne of France, and the princes of Europe were restored to their former quiet.
4. In those days men shall seek death and not find it. Napoleon's veterans rushed up to the very cannon's mouths, and seemed to seek death, but came out oftentimes unscathed.
5. The shapes of the locusts were like horses prepared for battle, with golden crowns on their heads and faces like men. Murat's cavalry were the admiration of all Europe, and princes fought in the army of the man who gave and took away crowns at his pleasure. The lion's teeth will answer for Napoleon's marked battery. Long hair is often worn in horsemen's caps.
6. "They had breastplates, as it were plates of iron." This will answer for the cuirassiers, who wore steel breastplates. "The sound of their wings was as the chariots of many horses running to battle." Napoleon's onsets were impetuous in the extreme, and the rattle of musketry like the crackling of chariot wheels.
7. "Tails like scorpions, and stings in their tails." This may be applied to bayonets, or to the match which looks like a serpent, and is applied to the tail of the piece to discharge it.
8. They had a king over them called Abaddon in the Hebrew, but hath his name Apollyon in the Greek. Take away the initial of the emperor's name, and we have it: *A-pol-e-on*.

Miller continues, verse 13:

And the sixth angel sounded, and I heard a voice from the four horns of the golden altar which is before God,

Verse 14. Saying to the sixth angel which had the trumpet, Loose the four angels which are bound in the great river Euphrates.

These angels were loosed to destroy the third part of men. Miller says they were Turks, Tartars, Arabs, and Saracens, who were to destroy and conquer one third part of the kingdoms and governments of the papal beast.

Verse 16. And the number of the army of the horsemen was two hundred thousand thousand; and I heard the number of them.

Here Mr. Miller is brought to the wall; but he leaps over it with incredible agility, and says that 200,000,000 of men would be more than there were ever on our earth capable of bearing arms; and he might also have added that the description of these warriors would answer to nothing which ever appeared on this globe. He chooses, however, to say that St. John heard the angel repeat 200,000 *twice*, which would make the number 400,000. Perhaps he thinks that the apostle, on account of his great age, was a little deaf by this time, and could not hear accurately; but he might have got over the difficulty by supposing that

the angel had an impediment in his speech, and, intending to say two hundred thousand, pronounced it two hundred thousand, pronounced it *two hundred thou-thousand*.

Verse 17. And thus I saw the horses in the vision, and them that sat on them, having breastplates of fire, and of jacinth, and brimstone; and the heads of the horses were as the heads of lions, and out of their mouths issued fire, and smoke, and brimstone.

Verse 18. By these three was the third part of men killed -- by the fire, and by the smoke, and by the brimstone, which issued out of their mouths.

Verse 19. For their power is in their mouth and in their tails; for their tails were like unto serpents, and had heads, and with them they do hurt.

**Our author remarks, among other things:**

Who ever saw an army of horsemen engaged in an action but would think of St. John's description: "Out of their mouths issued fire, and smoke, and brimstone," and in the breech of the guns were bullets, like "heads, and with these they do hurt"?

He says that guns and firearms were invented just before this last trump sounding, and that the Turks appropriated to themselves the invention.

But what shall we say to the breastplates of jacinth, and fire, and brimstone? What shall we say to the lion's heads and serpentine tails? If our author pleases to say that this prophecy is meant to apply to the Mahometan armies, he is at liberty to do so; but certainly, if the apostle had been taking special pains not to confound his horsemen with any earthly warriors, he could not have drawn a broader line of distinction. At first blush, the fire, and smoke, and brimstone seem remarkably applicable to gunpowder; but, when we reflect that smoke, and fire, and brimstone are so often used in the Scriptures in a different sense, we shall see no reason to take it for granted that they apply to gunpowder in this solitary instance.

We learn that the false prophet and others will be cast into a lake which burns with *fire and brimstone*. *Smoke* ascended out of the bottomless pit. "All liars shall have their portion in the lake which burns with *fire and brimstone*." The eyes of the Son of man were as a *flame of fire* and his feet "like unto fine brass, as if they burned in a furnace." "Out of the throne proceeded lightning, and thunderings, and voices." We hear nothing of *the noise* of Mr. Miller's firearms, which the apostle would certainly have noticed. "And the angel took the censer, and filled it with the fire of the altar, and cast it into the earth; and there were voices, and thunderings, and lightnings, and an earthquake." "A great mountain burning with fire was cast into the sea." "And he shall be tormented with *fire and brimstone* in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb; and the *smoke* of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever."

In short, fire and brimstone are frequently used in Scripture to imply the judgments of God upon the wicked. Sodom and Gomorrah were literally destroyed by fire and brimstone, not by gunpowder. Our Saviour threatens Capernaum with a worse



punishment than that which befell Sodom and Gomorrah. "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire," says the Saviour to the Jews, who claimed to be the favored people, and were yet to be persecuted and trodden down of all Christian nations for many centuries. "In flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God." St. Peter says the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah were condemned with an overthrow, as an example to those who should live ungodly after the destruction. St. Jude expresses the same sentiment. Of course fire and brimstone are here recognized as the ministers of divine vengeance. The apostle knew nothing of gunpowder; and we do not learn that, when the contention was so sharp between Paul and Barnabus, they called for coffee and pistols, which Christian gentlemen, in these days, regard as so necessary to the preservation of their *honor*.

We may, in connection with the foregoing views, believe the fire, and brimstone, and smoke of which the apostle speaks, did literally come from the *mouths* of the *horses*. It is a common expression of Scripture. The Son of man was to smite the man of sin with the breath of his mouth. The conqueror on the white horse had a sword which proceeded out of his mouth.

## CHAPTER IX.

In his ninth and tenth lectures our hero endeavors to prove that the seven churches to whom St. John writes, in Revelations, are not seven contemporary churches; but that he addresses the church in its seven ages, from that time forward, until the destruction of the world.

The first church or age is apostolic;

the second precedes the emperor Constantine;

the third prepares for the papal beast;

and the fourth is the church in the wilderness, that is, persons not connected with the Catholic church, but in opposition to her and her creed;

the fifth is still addressed to the church in the wilderness, which began about the tenth century;

and the sixth is the church of Luther, or the Protestant church; and to this church is said -- "Behold, I have set before thee a door which no man can shut," which, according to our author, alludes to the fact that those dissenters who had been crushed and kept out of sight previous to the reformation, now came out into the light, and went boldly forward, and that the power of the beast to put them down existed no longer. The door was opened, and the progress of Protestant principles could not now be checked; the door was opened.

The seventh church, he says, is the church from the year 1798 until the end of the world. By this we learn that the church remained distinguished as the proper church of Christ, until after the year 508 or 538, and that then St. John turns short off from the Catholic church, and addresses the various persons scattered up and down, who were not in connection with the visible church.

By turning to the ninth and tenth lectures of Mr. Miller, the reader will be able to judge how far he has made good his assertions. There is scarcely a shadow of proof, and many of his arguments are very awkward and ridiculous. Other portions of those two lectures, however, are not destitute of *cunning*. There can be no doubt that the apostle was addressing seven distinct and contemporary churches in Asia.

Where can our author trace that the *church in the wilderness* of which he speaks? The reader must bear in mind that he repudiates Unitarians and Universalists; therefore he cannot allude to the Arians or the followers of Origen.

In the days of the apostle, the church in the wilderness was composed of the Gnostics, the Nicolaitans, the followers of Simon the Magician, and some others; all of whom the apostles frequently caution the flock against. The Gnostics pretended to extraordinary light, and to a wonderful knowledge of mysteries. The Nicolaitans believed in the lawfulness of adultery and a community of wives. The Cerethians taught that the reign of Jesus Christ would be terrestrial, and that the saints would dwell with him on earth, enjoying all manner of sensual delights in that period. Some believed that this reign would be a time of great spiritual enjoyment, Christ dwelling here with his elect. Papias, a disciple of St. John the Evangelist, was the ringleader of this sect, who is said to have understood literally what was spoken in a mystical sense. This doctrine of the millennium owes its origin to the Jews, who expected a reign of a thousand years on earth with their Messiah. Simon pretended to be a Christian, and sometimes termed himself their Messiah. He had a great many followers, and many were deceived by his *miracles*. It is said that he contrived to ascend into the air, in a chariot of fire, in the presence of Nero, he being a great favorite with that gentleman.

In the year 140, one Cerdo went about teaching that there were two gods, the one rigorous and severe, the other merciful and forgiving. Another person, called Valentine, revived the errors of Simon Magus, and was excommunicated at about the same time with Cerdo. There were also the Montanites, who arose about the year 170, who regarded their leader as the Holy Ghost. These people professed to be inspired, kept long fasts, and were extremely rigid. They declaimed against the church of Rome in strains much like those of Miller. Trapozito taught that Melchisedec was greater than Christ; and one Theodotus

taught that Christ was but an ordinary man. These men were excommunicated, and joined Mr. Miller's *church in the wilderness*. Praxeas taught that there was but one person in Christ, and that the Father was crucified as well as the Son: he was excommunicated, and his followers joined the *church in the wilderness*. There were also some who taught that Jesus Christ had never come in the flesh, (of whom St. John speaks, and whom he terms antichrists;) and many other strange doctrines were broached, and continued to be taught at various times. Such irregular persons were cut off from the church, and became "the church in the wilderness." We hear of no other persons who would answer Mr. Miller's description of "the true church," up to the twelfth century. Does Mr. Miller mean to say that these men were the church that was nourished 1260 years in the wilderness? It was certainly a very irregular church.

The Manicheans had been hovering about the regular church for about a thousand years, sowing sedition, and counseling bloodshed. In the thirteenth century, they had become strong enough to burn churches, demolish monasteries, and finally entered the field with a hundred thousand men. They were met and conquered by the civil troops. The Waldenses, who arose some time in the twelfth or thirteenth century, were rigid predestinarians, and were opposed to all order and regularity, saying that any man might preach and administer the sacraments. These men demolished churches, and raged violently against the Catholics. They believed in transubstantiation and confession, and held that as many steps as one took in dance, so many steps he took toward hell. They seem to have been a mixture of the Quaker, the Calvinist, and the Catholic; but full of self-righteousness and bigotry.

Now will our author pretend that any of these men were the church in the wilderness? If not, what becomes of the 1260 years? If not, his whole argument falls to the ground. Fortunately, we have a *certain standard*; and out of our own author's mouth we will condemn both him and his theory. He says, on the last page of his book, --

"Can you not discern the signs of the times?" Let me give you one rule by which you may know a false doctrine. They may have many good things in their creeds, they may be very plausible in their arguments, and after all deceive you. But examine them closely, and you will find they will deny, ridicule, or try to do away some prominent doctrine of the Bible; such as the divinity of Christ, his second coming, (!) office of the Holy Ghost, eternal punishment, doctrine of grace, election, conviction of sin, regeneration, repentance, or faith. And when you hear or see them make light or scoff at any thing of this kind in the word of God, go not after them, nor bid them God speed.

The reader now knows the creed of Mr. Miller: he is a thorough Calvinist, and is so firmly rooted in the doctrines enumerated above, that he will not even bid a man God speed who thinks differently from himself. Of course, then, Unitarians, Universalists, Methodists, Episcopalians, Catholics, Quakers, and other denominations, are all heretics, with whom it would be criminal "so much as to eat." (See 2 John 9, 10, 11.)

Now I demand of Mr. Miller whether there ever was a church or sect, previous to John Calvin and Martin Luther, who taught the doctrines in which Miller believes. If they were not of his opinion, then they were teachers of false doctrines, and it would be criminal, as

he says, to bid such men God speed. But will he say that Luther and Calvin came up out of the wilderness, where they had been fed, and where their predecessors had been fed 1260 years? Certainly not; for both those gentlemen were monks, who had taken the vow of eternal celibacy, and who came directly out of the bosom of the great whore of Babylon. What, then, becomes of Mr. Miller's 1260 years?

Our author says the sixth age of the church is styled Philadelphia, signifying *brotherly love*. Let us hear this base fabricator:

The signification of the name of this church, Philadelphia, is *brotherly love*, and this age began about the time of the Reformation; for then God opened an effectual door for the gospel to be spread, which no man or set of men have been able to shut. And the early reformers displayed a zeal [brotherly love?] and fearlessness in their cause which astonished their friends and confounded their enemies. At this time, too, Christian love and fellowship was evidently one of the strongest marks of the day, and manifested that the work was of God.

If any person can read the last clause of the above quotation without being sensible of the desperate straits to which Mr. Miller is driven for the support of his theory, he must be indeed blind to the most glaring facts on the page of modern history. If there ever was a time when the very demon of discord raged, when murder, rapine, robbery, and in tense sectarian hate turned the land into pandemonium, it was at the time of the Reformation. No sooner had the reformers commenced their career, no sooner had they found it impossible to obey Luther's call to "bathe their arms to the elbows in the blood of popes, cardinals, and bishops," than they fell violently afoul of each other. Luther pronounced sentence of eternal woe against Calvin, and Calvin, with the smoke of Servetus's burning body in his throat, belched out the damnation of Luther. Melanchthon, the intimate of Luther, said the latter was more of a brute than a Christian. Throughout England, the furious flame of persecution raged up and down, like a whirl of fire. As soon as the German insurgents had finished their plunderings and massacres in their own land, they were sent for to defend and establish the new faith in Britain. The German bayonet, the rack, the gibbet, the iron hoop -- termed, in the slang of that age, "the scavenger's daughter" -- were called into requisition, in order to set up this religion of "brotherly love;" and King Henry VIII at the head of the church, with that bloody monster, Cranmer, burned men for every variation in the new creed, insomuch that people knew not what to profess in order to escape the blood-red hand of Cranmer and his satellites, Ridley and Latimer. The Calvinists in France were little better than banditti; murder and destruction of property being their principle aim. Nor was this bloody scene enacted only in the outbreak of the Reformation. When the English church became established, and the king, without regard to character, was put in as head of the church, then came the persecution of the Dissenters. -- Perhaps Mr. Miller admires the tender mercies of the *Scotch boot*, by which the leg and foot of the victim were crushed until he recanted and joined the Protestant church. Various sects arose, and began condemning and persecuting each other with the malice of fiends: the Quakers were beaten, starved, and imprisoned by the Church of England, and hanged by the Puritans.

"Brotherly love" first dawned in our own country when Lord Balti- more, a Catholic, proclaimed liberty of Conscience in Maryland, and William Penn did the same in

Pennsylvania. But not until the sects became too many and too weak to persecute, not until the arm was tired with slaughter, and the *power* was taken away, did these new sects cease to bruise each other. And it is very evident that, if Mr. Miller had the power, he would now persecute every man who dissented from his own religion, or who presumed to dispute his silly theory about the second coming of Christ.

## CHAPTER X.

In the commencement of his twelfth lecture, our commentator says:

The book of Revelation has been called by thousands a sealed book; and many a dear saint, while in this imperfect state of vision and knowledge, has wept much because they could not read and understand the book.

I venture to assert, that it would have been better had Brother Miller followed the example of his *dear saints*. They have set him an example of humility, which contrasts much with his self-confidence, and the difference is altogether in their favor. But our hero is doubtless aware, that *all* the "dear saints" have not regarded the Revelation as a sealed book. About the year 1700, a certain sect of people went forth to prophesy, among whom were one Lacy, an Englishman, Sir Richard Bulkley, and Fatio de Duiller, of Switzerland. This trio of worthies succeeded as well as Mr. Miller: they wrought miracles, danced, ate spiritually, and acknowledged no superior in church or state. They could throw themselves into violent convulsions at the shortest notice, and were almost as expert as Luther in wrestling with the devil. These gentlemen had discovered that they lived on the very verge of the millennium, and loudly and constantly did they proclaim the approach of that happy period. They had received extraordinary light; they could describe every feather on Gabriel's wing; and all the texts of Scripture were as familiar to them as the beads of the rosary to a Catholic maiden. Their millennium did not come; they had made a mistake in their reckoning; they should have fixed the time in 1843. Ah! there is the point where they were at issue with Mr. Miller. But they agreed with our author in one thing: they bellowed antichrist! antichrist! and prophesied that in a few days the papal beast, and all kings, governors, and constables, would be burned to ashes. They labored hard to bring about the fulfillment of their scorching prophecy, but could not produce the requisite ignition.

In his thirteenth lecture, we have the two witnesses spoken of in Revelation, who are the Old and New Testament, according to our author. A description of the French Revolution follows, as if there were not bloody deeds committed in olden time to which the prophecies of the apostle would apply much better than to the reign of infidelity in France. This lecture is full of slanders and falsehoods: some of them are stale, and have been often refuted; others are forged to answer our author's purpose. Our author says that if any man will hurt these two witnesses (the Old and New Testament) fire proceeds out of their mouth and kills them; and he says that this was the case with deistical France, in the Revolution.

The rulers of France, in the Revolution, proclaimed a war of extermination against the fisherman's Bible, as they were pleased to term it; and within six years they exterminated themselves, the republic, and almost all their principles.

On the preceding page, our author complains that the beast hid and perverted the Bible. Now how can he call this deistical warfare a war against the Bible, when he knows that those revolutionists were at war with the beast -- faithful allies of his own? He well knows that the Catholic clergy were the objects of their vengeance; and that those holy men were martyred by hundreds in cold blood; and that they were seen calmly confessing their sins to each other, and kneeling in prayer before the beautiful emblems of their faith, while the ax was grinding and the bayonet was screwed on for their destruction. The beloved and honored Cheverus was one of those clergy, and narrowly escaped death; and while the Protestant priests were, on all sides, giving up their religion and forsaking Christ, the confessor of Louis XVI attended his king to the scaffold, and, as the ax fell, and the minister of God was sprinkled with the sovereign's blood, he undauntedly exclaimed, "*Enfant de St. Louis, montez au ciel!*" [Child of St. Louis! ascend to heaven!]

The following passage in this lecture deserves a moment's thought:

About the close of the eighteenth century, in consequence of the abominable corruptions of the church of Rome being exposed to public view, the men of the world began to treat revelation as a fiction, and religion as priestcraft, and, instead of searching for the pillar and ground of the truth, [see 1 Tim. iii. 15,] "their imaginations became vain, and their foolish minds were darkened"; they declared war against the Bible, the "two witnesses," which war became general all over Europe and America.

Here we learn that the exposure of popish errors brought about infidelity. Those exposures were chiefly made in a previous century; and, with regard to infidelity, it has been steadily increasing, in England and America, for the last 300 years; and, we shall have a new batch of infidels, hot from Miller's oven, and ready to avouch, at the point of the bayonet, that there is neither angel nor resurrection.

Let me ask the candid reader what effect the following denunciations will have upon wavering minds:

And once more, let me inquire how it stands with you, my dear hearer? Are you prepared for that great and solemn day? Are you ready to meet the judgment? The two witnesses will appear for or against you. Their testimony will not fail. (!!!) Do you believe them? He that believeth will be saved, and he that believeth not, shall be damned.

The above is certainly explicit. We are told, in so many words, that if we do not believe Mr. Miller's interpretation of the Scriptures, we shall be condemned to eternal woe. Here is the claim of infallibility *with a vengeance*. I begin to have some misgivings that William Miller is antichrist. It is very evident that our gentleman has been employed or encouraged by certain sects, in this land, who have, of late years, lost ground considerably. The regular, old, gloomy, savage, brimstone-blue church has been sorely afflicted by the progress of more mild and popular doctrine, as well as by the partiality which many of their preachers have shown for the gentler portion of our race. Mr. Miller can prove, however, that "faith

works by *love*"; and Calvin expressly taught that *good works* were wholly unnecessary under the new dispensation. It is necessary that these old skeleton sects should be clothed with flesh, and "all is fish that comes to their net"; and if Mr. Miller can drive them within the pale, with fire and brimstone, like one of Scott's heroes chasing the Highlanders with a red-hot poker, it will answer their purpose admirably.

Among the proofs of Miller's dishonesty, I cannot avoid noticing the following, which is taken from his seventeenth lecture:

I believe all writers and commentators on the Apocalypse agree that the church of Christ has been in the wilderness more than twelve centuries past. Some have fixed the time of the church entering into her wilderness state as early as A. D. 534, when the great controversy between the Orthodox and Arians, which in the days of Justinian shook the religious world. &c.

Here we have a palpable falsehood, which may be detected at any time. There was no such controversy in the days of Justinian. The empress Theodora endeavored to promote the sect of Acephali, and, finding that she could not obtain her ends, persecuted the pope, who was stripped of his pontifical ornaments, and sent into exile. This happened in the days of Justinian. But the great Arian controversy took place in the fourth century. The council of Nice decided against Arianism in 325, although the dispute was continued a few years after that date.

It is easy to perceive that Miller places this controversy in the days of Justinian, in order to fix the date of his wilderness church as near to 538 as possible.

The opinion for which the empress Theodora contended was simply that of one nature in Christ; that he was wholly divine, and not possessed of a human soul at all. The Arians contended that Jesus Christ was a created being, who existed before the world was made, but inferior to the Father.

In order to convict Mr. Miller of falsehood, although hardly necessary, I will quote from three different authors to prove that the great Arian controversy was settled in the fourth century.

Voltaire says:

Constantine convened at Nicea, opposite to Constantinople, the first ecumenical council in which Osius presided. There was determined the great question which disturbed the church, concerning Christ's divinity; one side availing themselves of the opinion of Origen, who, in chapter vi against Celsus, says, "We offer up our prayers to God, through Jesus, who holds the middle place between created nature and the uncreated nature, who brings to us his Father's grace, and presents our prayers to the great God as our high priest."

Dr. Priestly, the Unitarian, says:

The emperor Constantine, having endeavored in vain to compose those differences in the religion which he had lately professed, and especially to reconcile Arius and Alexander, at length called a general council of bishops at Nice, the first which had obtained that appellation, and in this council after much indecent

wrangling, and violent debate, Arius was condemned and banished to Illyricum, a part of the Roman empire very remote from Alexandria, where the controversy originated.

Gahan, in his *Church History*, says:

To put a stop to the unhappy disputes that were raised by the Arians and divided the church, Constantine, the emperor, zealously concurred in assembling a general council, this being the only remedy adequate to the growing evil, and capable of restoring peace to the church. By letters of respect he invited the bishops, from all parts of the world, to the city of Nice, in Bythinia, and defrayed their expenses. They assembled in the imperial palace on the 19th of June, in the year 325. The emperor entered the council without guards, nor would he sit till he was requested, as Eusebius says. The renowned Osius, bishop of Corduba, in Spain, presided thereat in the name of St. Sylvester, by whom he was commissioned. The fathers, thus assembled, in invitation of the apostles on a similar occasion, examined, refuted, and proscribed the doctrine of Arius, and cut him off from the communion of the faithful. They ascertained the Catholic faith, and drew up a solemn profession, known by the name of the *Nicene Creed*; wherein, to exclude all the subtleties of the Arians, they declared, in terms that left no subterfuge for error, no room for heresy to play in, *the Son consubstantial with the Father*.

Now Mr. Miller has expressly stated that his wilderness church took its flight at the time of the great Arian controversy. Then what becomes of his 1260 years, his 666 years, and his 538, for the setting up of the papal beast? He knew that his reckoning would be wrong if he gave the correct date for this controversy; and he therefore pretends that it occurred in the day of Justinian, two centuries after it really took place.

In the days of Justinian, the empress Theodora took sides with the Acephali -- a rigid sect of the Eutychians. But these people did not divide the church into two great parties: they were dissenters from the church, and were divided among themselves. Dr. Priestly says:

In 535 the Eutychians divided, some of them maintaining that there were some things which Christ did not know, while others asserted that he knew everything, even the time of the day of judgment.

How would that people have been surprised had they lived in this day of light and knowledge, when mere mortals know all about the day of judgment! Alas! mathematics had not then undergone those improvements in which we rejoice in this age! Had the bishops exchanged the miter and crosier for the slate and pencil, they might have become wiser than Christ.

In his thirteenth lecture we find the following characteristic misrepresentations:

Verse 8. "And their dead bodies shall lie in the streets of the great city which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also our Lord was crucified."

This verse teaches us that the word of God would be made a dead letter, by the authority of one of the principle kingdoms out of one of the ten into which the Roman government was divided, and that they would be guilty of the same sins that Sodom and Egypt were guilty of, and also of crucifying our Lord, in a spiritual sense. This will apply to France in particular. France, previous to and in the French revolution was guilty of Sodomitish sins; and also held in bondage, like Egypt, the people of God; and, in France, Christ had been crucified in his people, on St. Bartholomew's eve, A. D. 1572, when 50,000 Huguenots were murdered in one night.



The two witnesses, whose dead bodies are spoken of above, were probably Paul and Peter, who were both put to death by Nero in Rome. "Where also our Lord was crucified" alludes, probably, to the fact that St. Peter perished on the cross; insomuch as Peter was the principal disciple of our Lord, was commissioned to feed his sheep and lambs, and, as far as possible, supplied the place of Jesus Christ after his ascension. Christ was crucified afresh in his servant St. Peter; but not in the persons of the Huguenots, who were put to death on political grounds. The Duke of Guise, an inestimable nobleman, had been treacherously assassinated at the instance of Cologni, the chief of the insurgent sect, and also by the persuasion of one *Beza*, a miserable fanatic of that age. This wicked deed had, however, been overlooked, and the king of France had even invited the Huguenots to the celebration of a marriage between the king's sister and the young king of Navarre. When these people entered Paris the inhabitants very naturally recollected the treacherous conduct of Cologni; but every thing would have gone peaceably enough had not a relation of the murdered duke fired at Cologni in the street. The followers of this man were highly incensed at this outrage, and, rallying around their leader, swore vengeance against the government itself. The king resolved to quench this rising treason at once, knowing that no terms could be kept with the Huguenots. He was even persuaded to attack them on the instant; in consequence of which, some fifteen hundred of those rebellious people were sacrificed.

A Church of England writer thus speaks of that unfortunate affair:

The massacre at Paris very far exceeded the wishes of the court, and orders were instantly despatched to the great towns in the provinces to prevent similar scenes. Such scenes took place, however, in several places; but though, by some Protestant writers, the whole number of persons killed has been made to amount to *a hundred thousand*, an account published in 1582, and made up from accounts *collected from the ministers in the different towns*, made the number for all France amount to 786 persons! Dr. Lingard, with his usual fairness, says, "If we double this number we shall not be far from the real amount." The Protestant writers began at one hundred thousand, then fell to seventy thousand, then to thirty thousand, then to twenty thousand, then to fifteen thousand, and, at last, to ten thousand. All in round numbers! One of them, in an hour of great indiscretion, ventured upon obtaining returns of *names* from the ministers themselves; and then came out the 786 persons in the whole! A number truly horrible to think of, but a number not half so great as that of those English Catholics whom "*good Queen Bess*" had, even at this time, (the 14th year of her reign,) caused to be *ripped up, racked till the bones came out of their sockets*, or caused to be despatched, or to die in prison or in exile; and this, too, observe, not for rebellions, treasons, robberies, and assassinations, like those of Cologni and his followers; but simply and solely for adhering to the religion of their and her fathers, which religion she had openly practiced for years, and to which religion she had most solemnly sworn that she sincerely belonged.

So much for Miller's commentary on the Revelations, and his dastardly falsehoods, in order to throw odium upon a class of the community whom he hates with all the malignity of the original tempter.

## CONCLUSION.

I have now examined the principal arguments of William Miller; not so fully as I could have wished, but as far as the prescribed limits of this work permitted me. It will be observed that his argument is wholly grounded upon the belief that paganism ended in the Roman empire in 666 years after the league between the Jews and Romans, and 508 years after Christ; that in thirty years commenced the reign of the image beast, or antichrist, which reign continued until 1798, or 1260 years, during all of which time the true church of Christ existed, collateral with the beast; and that, in order to make up the 2300 days of Daniel, there are 45 years to be added to the 1798. He says, from the time when the decree went forth to build Jerusalem until the time of the Saviour's death, was seventy weeks, or 490 years; the pagan abomination would be taken away 475 years afterwards; the papal abomination would be set up 30 years after that, and would continue 1260 years; and that then but 45 years would be wanting to complete the 2300 days, when the papal abomination, or abomination which maketh desolate, would be utterly destroyed, in the grand consummation of all things. In all this he has taken it for granted that 2300 days stand for 2300 years; that forty two months stand for 1260 years; and a time, times, and a half, stands for 1260 years. According to his computation, the ten kings who received power as kings *one hour* with the beast must have had this power but the 24th part of a year. When "there was silence in heaven for the space of half an hour," this silence must have lasted more then a week. Indeed, there is no rule by which we may determine when days are intended to mean days, and when they are intended to mean years: so that the Creator may have been six years in creating the world, and the Saviour may have fasted for forty years; and this last will appear more probable, when we remember that the Scripture says he was *an hungered* after this fast.

I know it may be said that *prophetic* days, months, and weeks are not to be reckoned as other days, months, and weeks; yet, as prophetic days are sometimes so reckoned, how or when can we decide their true meaning? Miller thinks he has decided this point, by being able to show that the events prophesied of have all taken place -- with the exception of the resurrection -- in the specified time, a day being taken for a year, a week for seven years, and a month for thirty years. But here I think he has failed; and I have endeavored, in the preceding pages, to show that those events did not take place as he has represented them. The passages in Daniel which he applies to Napoleon and to the papal beast will better apply to Antiochus; for, during his persecution of the Jews, there was a time of trouble greater than that nation had ever before experienced. Many apostatized from Judaism, while those who remained firm endured the most dreadful inflictions. Antiochus penetrated to the holy of holies, and desecrated the temple, by offering *a large hog* on the sacred altar. And with respect to the setting up of the papal abomination in 538, it is all imaginary. Constantine had been converted in 312, and surely it was no subject of regret that an emperor should become a Christian. St. Paul says to king Agrippa, "I would that not only thou, but all who hear me this day, were as I am, except these bonds." The popes exercised no more authority in 538 than they had always done; and the Catholic church underwent no change at that particular time, but remained as she had been for centuries

previous. At a much later day, there were one or two popes who assumed more temporal power than became them; but they were only exceptions to a general practice.

But let us take a more general view of this subject. Our author frequently calls upon us to regard "the signs of the times." Now what prospect is there of the horrible scene of anarchy, riot, and general ruin, which ought to have commenced even now? If the end of all things is to take place in 1843, -- and if, previous to that time, the world is to be turned upside down, -- if there is to be an end to all civil order, -- if the son is to be in arms against the parent, and the parent against the son, -- if treason, murder, robbery, and continual uproar, are to be the *order* of the day, it is certainly high time that we made a beginning; and I must say that I fear Mr. Miller is doing his part to bring about such deplorable events.

In the first place, to persist in prophesying of such a state of things is the readiest way to hasten it on. But will rational men and women permit themselves to be jostled from their propriety by a man whose ends would be answered, and whose fame would be augmented, by their utter destruction. Dr. Young says:

How fain our thoughts to fancy what we wish!

Shall the wish of Mr. Miller be gratified? Shall we aid him in the fulfillment of his prophecy? But there is more mischief in this man than may at first sight appear. How artfully has he taken advantage of a popular prejudice against our naturalized fellow-citizens, and the religion which they generally profess! After laboring to prove that the Catholic church is the horrible beast against which Heaven and all her servants are waging war, he calls upon us to believe, as a duty most sacred, that the church will very soon rise up in its strength and make war upon the saints -- that, before the year 1843, the Catholics will make a desperate attack upon the true church of Christ -- that they will gather themselves together in Amageddon, for the purpose of slaughtering the armies of God! What is the following rant but a call for general riot and religious persecution?

The dragon begins to sound for the onset; the armies of the beast begin to muster for the battle; they are furbishing their swords for the slaughter; the kings of the earth are combining against the freedom of their subjects, &c.

Who that reads the above can avoid believing that the author is a reckless and violent man? Who can resist the conclusion that he is willing to turn the world upside down, if he can but obtain a little notoriety for himself, and gratify his own malicious and fiendish desires? There is, indeed, a class of men who have risen up lately, ay, and some women too, whose sole aim appears to be the promotion of anarchy and confusion. Some of them are disappointed persons, who are resolved to gain the notice and attention of mankind. They aim to unloose the bands of social life; they seem to be discontented, and dissatisfied with every thing. They can live only in a continual tempest, and, because their own passions are raging like the sea in a storm, they endeavor to make every body else unhappy and dissatisfied. I repeat the question: is there any prospect, are there any signs now, of the

general anarchy throughout the world which this man has declared to be at our very doors?

What shall I say to those who have been already duped by this prince of quacks and deceivers? You will tell me that the day of judgment is to come as a thief in the night, and that no one can say it will not come in the year 1843. But if all that is granted, it is no less certain that no person can say it *will* arrive in that year. We are assured in Holy Scripture that the angels themselves do not know. You may reply, that the angels do not know *the day and the hour*, but that they know the *year*. Let us consider this objection a moment. The angel who told Daniel about those events which were to befall his nation, could have reckoned from the very moment when the decree went forth to build Jerusalem. He must have known the day and the hour, if the end of the world was meant by the end of the 2300 days. Let us also recollect the circumstances under which the disciples questioned the Lord. They desired to know when those things would take place: they did not know but they would occur during their own lives. When Christ told them that neither men nor angels, that none but the Father, knew the time, he did not intend to turn them off with a mere quibble and play upon words. He meant that he could not satisfy them on the subject; for surely, if he had told them *the year*, they would have required no farther information; for when they learned that it would take place at so distant a day, the exact hour would have been a matter of small concern to them.

Why will you not learn wisdom from those who have gone before you, instead of surrendering up your judgment into the hand of a man who endeavors to revive the heart-burnings and the vagaries of a former century? There is nothing new or original in these wayward fancies; and it is not to be supposed that the fanatics of former days ran their wild courses without supposing they had reason and Scripture on their side. They felt as confident as you do. They supposed they lived in an age when marvelous things were to be brought about, even as Miller does. Politicians and religionists have always been on the eve of some mighty revolution; *crises* are the order of the day in every age. Espouse not, then, the desperate cause of Miller. Suffer not yourselves to be numbered with the *lo heres!* and *lo theres!* of other days, whose frantic excesses are the scoff of the infidel and a stumbling-block to the wavering.

You may think that I have not fully answered Miller's arguments; but take not occasion from thence to suppose that they are unanswerable. Some persons have endeavored to answer infidel authors, but not possessing equal wit and knowledge, have wholly failed in the attempt. But you are not only mistaken in your opinions, -- you are the propagators of mischief; you are bringing discredit on the gospel; you are binding the brows of the infidel with laurel. You are also sapping the foundations of civil society; you are filling the hearts of the simple with amazement. In his great wisdom, the Almighty has seen proper to hide from us the time of his second appearance, because the expectation of so wonderful an event would throw mankind into a ferment; because we could not regularly pursue the various occupations, and fulfill the many duties of life, if our whole souls were filled with the expectation of the general judgment. Will you contrive a way to circumvent the

**Almighty? Will you make void his decrees, and deprive the world of the benefits which he had intended for us, by getting up a fictitious day of judgment?**

**"Behold the bridegroom cometh!" It is true that our Saviour declared that this cry would be heard; but not until the bridegroom was manifestly come; for the foolish virgins, instead of doubting his arrival, immediately demanded oil at the hands of the wise virgins. So that, even admitting this parable had reference to the day of judgment, it will not apply to the present case. That time is hidden from all but God; and so our Saviour expressly declares. It was to prevent men from framing such theories as that of Miller, that Christ assured his disciples the time was known only to God.**

**This audacious man has also declared that, after next August, there is no repentance nor forgiveness of sin! This is but a consequence of his presumption in naming the year of the resurrection. The one grows out of the other. He sets bounds to the mercy of God, and declares that no sinner shall be saved after next August. Persons who believe him are thus liable to be driven to despair, unless as confident of their acceptance with God as he is.**

**Let me then conclude by advising all lovers of peace, good order, and the gospel, to beware of the leaven of William Miller, to fulfill their several duties in life quietly, patiently, and with resignation to the will of Heaven, to be "amazed with no sudden amazement," and to avoid all clamorous persons who aim to create excitements that they may ride conspicuously on the foam of the waves which they have raised.**

**A rage for becoming great reformers, the founders and leaders of new sects and parties, predominates in this age of the world: a want of humility, of temperance, and habitual sobriety, leads infatuated men to seek distinction, while a predominance of self-esteem inspires them with the belief that they are peculiarly qualified for doing wonders. O for the honest simplicity of other days, when men were content to do right; when they patiently listened to deserved reproof, and were more intent on reforming themselves than in reforming the world. "Be ye not many masters" was the exhortation of Paul to the flock in his day; but now there are so many who desire to be masters and leaders, that it is difficult to point out the followers, and the sheep and the lambs of the flock. Every sheep is wiser than his shepherd, and every lamb is taught to push with his tender horns against the stakes and boundaries of the New Jerusalem. There was a time when sacred things were respected, and when infidels could not deny that believers sincerely cherished the faith which they professed. There was a time when great men did not suppose themselves above the word of God, and the laws of his church; but then people did not run after every lo here! and lo there! supposing them to be "the great power of God." The foot did not essay to enact the part of the head, nor did the elbows invade the province of the breast. They did not heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears, and ever on the watch for some new thing. Such things as veneration, high-souled and confiding faith, were known in the earlier ages of Christianity, and the true shepherds of the flock were held in esteem by the wise and the simple, the weak and the powerful.**

**Who can read the following account of the emperor Theodosius, without admiring the faith and the humility of a hero who, notwithstanding his worldly power and authority, bowed to the cross of Christ, and recognized him in his servant:**

But Theodosius unhappily forgot the clemency and moderation which he had shown on this occasion, when he received an account of another tumultuous insurrection that happened in Thessalonica, where the populace stoned Botheric, the governor of that city, to death. When the emperor was apprised hereof, instead of checking the impetuosity of his hasty disposition, he suffered himself immediately to be carried away by the first transports of his passion, and issued a commission, or warrant, for the soldiery to be let loose for three hours on the inhabitants of Thessalonica, till about 7000 of them were massacred, without distinguishing the innocent from the guilty.

The horror with which the news of this tragical scene filled the breast of St. Ambrose is not to be expressed. After giving the emperor a little time to reflect, and enter himself, he wrote him a letter, wherein he declared that he neither could nor would receive his offerings at mass, nor celebrate the divine mysteries before him, till he expiated, by an exemplary penance, the enormity of the massacre lately committed. The emperor, notwithstanding, resolved to go to the church of Milan, according to custom. St. Ambrose, meeting him at the church porch, forbade him any further entrance. The prince alleging, by way of extenuating his guilt, that king David had also sinned, the holy bishop replied, "Him whom you have followed in sinning, follow also in his repentance."

Theodosius submitted to this sentence as if pronounced by God himself, and returned to his palace, bewailing his miserable condition, and saying, "The church is open to beggars and slaves, and to the meanest of my subjects; but the doors of it, and consequently the gates of heaven also, are shut against me."

He remained shut up at home in his oratory for the space of eight months, clad with penitential weeds, imploring mercy and pardon, and shedding many tears. When the feast of Christmas was come, he went to the enclosure of the church, placed himself in the rank of the public penitents, prostrate on the ground, and striking his breast with grief, and with tears running down his cheeks, begging pardon of God in the sight of all the people, who were so touched with his humility and edifying piety, that they wept and prayed with him for a considerable time.

In short, he made an open confession of his sins, accepted and performed the public penance enjoined him by St. Ambrose, according to the sacred canons; for the church, instructed by the word and example of the apostles, was accustomed then to inflict public penance upon public sinners, and these penances were determined by the bishops, according to the particular circumstances of the case.

**Who can read the above simple yet sublime recital of the faith and loyalty of the sinful emperor, without remembering the stone cut out of the mountain without hands, which was to break principalities and powers to pieces; not by bloodshed, fire and murder -- as recommended by Miller -- but by the power of the Holy Spirit, and the benign authority of the legitimate rulers of the church, acting on behalf of the Lord Jesus Christ. Why, then, do we labor to scatter in Israel and divide in Jacob? Why all these false prophets, these ringleaders, and founders of new orders? Whence is this strange fire? Better by far that we go back, and do our first works; for, in endeavoring to do greater things than our fathers, we have only rent the garment of Christ, and cast lots for his vesture.**